

Sociology and Social Research

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

The Symposium	383
Seven Significant Changes in Sociology . .	385
ERNEST W. BURGESS	
Reflections on Changes in Sociology . . .	387
F. STUART CHAPIN	
Important Changes in Sociology	389
JOHN L. GILLIN	
A Forty-Year Perspective	391
FRANK H. HANKINS	
Trends in a Half Century of Sociology . .	399
WILLIAM F. OGBURN	
North American Sociology	401
STUART A. QUEEN	
Fifty Years of Change in Sociology . . .	404
PITIRIM A. SOROKIN	
Comments on Changes in Sociology . . .	409
JESSE F. STEINER	
Developments in Sociology	412
CARL C. TAYLOR	
Changes in Sociology Since 1900	414
LEOPOLD VON WIESE	
Changes in Sociology during Forty Years .	417
KIMBALL YOUNG	
Important Developments in Sociology . . .	419
FLORIAN ZNANIECKI	
History of the Pacific Sociological Society .	421
GEORGE M. DAY	
Forty Years of <i>Sociology and</i> <i>Social Research</i>	426
EMORY S. BOGARDUS	
Pacific Sociological Notes	433
Peoples and Culture	434
Social Problems and Welfare	439
Social Theory and Research	446
Social Fiction	452
Social Photoplay	454
Index to Volume 40	455

VOL. 40

JULY-AUGUST 1956

No. 6

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.50

SINGLE COPIES, 70 CENTS

Sociology and Social Research

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

PUBLISHED BIMONTHLY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY PARK, LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.50

SINGLE COPIES, 70¢

Entered as second-class matter March 31, 1936, at the post office at Los Angeles, California, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor

Emory S. Bogardus

Managing Editor

Martin H. Neumeyer

News Notes Editor

Edward C. McDonagh

Associate Editors

Robert A. Ellis

Harvey J. Locke

George B. Mangold

Bessie A. McClenahan

John E. Nordskog

James A. Peterson

Georges Sabagh

Melvin J. Vincent

University of
Southern California

Advisory Editors

Jessie Bernard.....	Pennsylvania State University
Herbert Blumer.....	University of California
Leonard Broom.....	University of California, Los Angeles
Ernest W. Burgess.....	University of Chicago
F. Stuart Chapin.....	University of Minnesota
George M. Day.....	Occidental College
John L. Gillin.....	University of Wisconsin
A. B. Hollingshead.....	Yale University
Katharine Jocher.....	University of North Carolina
William Kirk.....	Pomona College
Paul H. Landis.....	State College of Washington
Andrew W. Lind.....	University of Hawaii, Hawaii
George A. Lundberg.....	University of Washington
Radhakamal Mukerjee.....	Lucknow University, India
Meyer F. Nimkoff.....	Florida State University
Pitirim A. Sorokin.....	Harvard University
Leopold von Wiese.....	University of Cologne
Kimball Young.....	Northwestern University
Florian Znaniecki.....	University of Illinois

Contributed materials which appear in *Sociology and Social Research* do not necessarily express the opinion or the policy of the editorial staff and publisher.

PUBLISHED BY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PRESS
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

July-August 1956

THE SYMPOSIUM¹

It has seemed appropriate that the *Journal of Sociology and Social Research* should recognize its forty years of publication by presenting in the concluding issue for this year a symposium on Important Changes in Sociology During the Past Forty Years. To this end, a number of sociologists who began teaching sociology forty years or more ago have been invited to express their observations regarding these changes. Most of them have written informally; and, interestingly enough, nearly all, although most are retired, have reported that they are exceedingly busy with a plethora of interesting activities, chiefly of a writing nature.²

A few of the interesting variety of points that are developed in the Symposium may be noted. (1) During the past years sociology has increased in public esteem (J. F. Steiner), but when sociologists are employed in government or industry they are not called sociologists but by some other label (C. C. Taylor). (2) The emphasis by many younger sociologists on research has led them to relegate the importance of teaching sociology to a secondary place (K. Young). (3) Many sociologists seem to forget the fact that of the tens of thousands of students who are now taking courses in sociology few "are interested in studying sociology as a science." Most of them are enrolled in sociology "in order to become enlightened human beings" (C. C. Taylor). (4) Although sociologists deal with society and culture which have their "roots in the past," some take "a lofty position" that "the historical dimension is of no importance" and "ignore origins and developmental sequences" (K. Young).

There is considerable agreement among the contributors to the Symposium about the following changes in sociology in the past forty years: (1) the "grand system" makers have almost vanished; (2) social theory and empirical research are beginning to be integrated; (3) sociological

¹ The arrangement of the papers for this symposium has been made according to the alphabetical order of the names of the authors.

² Carl C. Taylor sends his paper from India, where he has been serving as a rural welfare consultant, and Jesse F. Steiner's paper came from Japan, where its author is a member of the faculty of the International Christian University. Leopold von Wiese's paper has come from his home university, the University of Cologne.

methodology is being improved; (4) small group research is surging forward; (5) sociology and cultural sociology are drawing closer together; (6) there is a moving away from value judgments not necessarily as objects of research but as criteria for research; and (7) there is a change in emphases concerning concepts, such as from evolution to social change and from the individual to social processes.

The Symposium is supplemented by two articles of a historical nature—one entitled *History of the Pacific Sociological Society* and the other, *Forty Years of Sociology and Social Research*.

SEVEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY

ERNEST W. BURGESS
University of Chicago

Since 1916 the changes in sociology in the United States have been sweeping. A few trends will be singled out for mention.

1. *A science of society based on empirical research.* In the previous two decades the American founders of sociology—Ward, Sumner, Giddings, Small, Cooley, and Ross—had surveyed the field, formulated points of view, and constructed conceptual systems. The second generation of sociologists spearheaded the movement for research exemplified in the early twenties by Thomas and Znaniecki in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. The third generation is intent on rigorous methods, conceptualization of the problem, project design, and methods of proof. The outstanding example to date is *The American Soldier* by Stouffer and associates.

2. *The division of sociology into subject matter areas.* To the earlier existing fields (sociological theory, population, social psychology, social organization, social change, and social disorganization) new fields have been added. Among these are human ecology, rural sociology, urban sociology, sociometry, educational sociology, industrial sociology, medical sociology, political sociology, and the sociology of religion. Then there are subjects within these fields that have achieved special positions such as the community, criminology, occupations and professions, race relations, small groups, and social stratification.

3. *Specialization of personnel.* The general sociologist was the conspicuous type of sociologist in the past. In the last forty years he has been succeeded by the specialist and the technician who tend to confine their research to a specific field, each with its conceptual system and methods of investigation.

4. *The application of sociology in applied fields.* Before 1916 there was a wide gap between social theory and social practice. Even the social survey method emerging in 1907 with the Pittsburgh Survey was concerned with gathering facts with little or no reference to any theoretical context. Today sociologists are employed by governmental and private agencies to carry out sociological studies of their problems. The Russell Sage Foundation has taken leadership in encouraging and supporting the collaboration of sociologists with the practicing professions.

5. *The creation of research methods and techniques.* The patterns of research procedure already available in other disciplines have been adapted to sociological research. Other methods particularly appropriate for data in sociological investigation have been developed. These include observational and sociometric techniques, interviewing methods, personal documents, tests, experimental design, rating scales, predictive instruments, role-playing, experimental participation, evaluation procedures, and methods of statistical and case-study analysis.

6. *Interdisciplinary collaboration.* The formation of the Social Science Research Council in 1923 was a recognition of the interdependence of the various social sciences. Interdisciplinary committees of the Council have functioned with increasing success to achieve cooperation of social scientists from different fields on problems of common interest. The organization of the department of social relations at Harvard University highlighted the essential interrelations of sociology with cultural anthropology, clinical psychology, and social psychology. Other universities have accomplished the same objective by interdisciplinary committees engaged in research in specific fields of joint interest.

7. *Integration of theory and research.* The growing diversification of sociology and the ramifications of its relations with the other social sciences pose the problem of integrating research findings into a systematic and unified general sociology. Much progress has been made toward this objective, but further advance depends on the efforts of the oncoming generation of sociologists.

The area in which sociologists are working is vast and their numbers are small. The next forty years should witness a great expansion in trained personnel, increase in funds and facilities, significant advances in the understanding of society and its problems, and active participation of applied sociologists in action research, in experimental projects, and in social planning.

REFLECTIONS ON CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY DURING THE PAST FORTY YEARS

F. STUART CHAPIN
*Emeritus Professor of Sociology,
University of Minnesota*

The present younger generation of professional sociologists, engaged in a great variety of research activities and scholarly pursuits, can hardly visualize the relatively low estate of sociology in the early decades of the twentieth century. A complete enumeration of the different directions taken by the expanding universe of sociological effort can hardly be made in these brief reflections, but a few developments may be indicated as exemplifying the relatively higher status of sociology in 1956.

A burst of interdisciplinary research effort began in the 1920's, spearheaded by such newly founded organizations as the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, *Social Science Abstracts*; followed in the 1930's by the Commission on the Social Studies, the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, and the *Social Trends* studies. In these efforts, liberally supported by several large national foundations, sociologists mingled with anthropologists, economists, historians, political scientists, psychologists, and statisticians in dealing with cross-disciplinary problems by interdisciplinary teams of research workers.

Gradually a body of more systematic social theory has emerged, in which theory that had formerly been largely speculative in character was drawn into closer relationship with empirical studies, to the great benefit of each form of scholarship. This was accomplished by the restatement of propositions, often deduced from sound theory and expressed as hypotheses and then tested by observations. As a result, we now have such promising developments as field theory, group dynamics, the sociometry of Moreno, the social structure and dynamics of Parsons, social and cultural change theories of Ogburn and Chapin, small group research and role theory, the power structures of society and its groups, and an emphasis on social status as a more realistic approach to the problem of social stratification than was afforded by older theories of social class distinctions—to mention only a few of these developments.

Along with these improvements has come considerable advance in research methods of observation and analysis, as the number of excellent

textbooks on methods of social research bears witness. Survey methods have been enriched by improvements in interviewing, schedule making, and the introduction of probability sampling techniques. Experimental sociology, as a method of observing social behavior under some conditions of control in the free community situation, has been tried out by Chapin, Greenwood, Stouffer, and many others. Laboratory experimentation on small groups has been started by Bales and others. The search for mathematical models of social situations and social processes has gained from the studies of Lazarsfeld, Stephan, Stouffer, and others. The mathematical training of graduate students in sociology has been extended and deepened.

Sociometric scaling techniques have been extended by Guttman and the Cornell sociologists, and these methods are now widely used. The distribution-free methods of statisticians have opened up to sociologists valid uses of more powerful tools of study, such as nonparametric analysis of variance.

These advances in theory and methods of research have been recognized by the larger public in a variety of ways. Beginning with the establishment of the National Councils about 1920, there followed such other developments as the founding in most large universities of local social science research organizations for the coordination of local research or for such technical research activities as social science laboratories with electronic equipment. In all these developments, National Foundations were invaluable in providing financial support, and in some cases they even initiated the new developments. Sociologists have become the executive heads of some national foundations, as Dollard of the Carnegie Corporation, and D. Young of the Russell Sage Foundation. As consultants and advisers and sometimes as directors of research, sociologists have been in demand by such diverse types of organizations as state and federal welfare agencies; the military research institutions of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy; the late League of Nations and the present United Nations, often in its Technical Assistance programs. Social psychologists, criminologists, and many other specialists in the large field of sociology have participated in the growing volume of contract research with private business enterprise and with local private organizations for social welfare, such as chests and councils of social agencies.

All in all, therefore, the contrast of sociology in 1956 with the sociology of the turn of the century is one which shows real gain in sound theory, methodology of research, and public esteem. These facts should serve as a challenge to the present generation of younger sociologists to direct their efforts toward still greater improvement in theory and research methods.

IMPORTANT CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

JOHN L. GILLIN
University of Wisconsin

Just fifty years ago I received my Ph.D. degree in Sociology from Columbia University. In the previous quarter of a century the sociological pioneers in the United States had laid the foundations of their several systems. Thirty years ago I dealt with the development up to the end of 1926. This was done in my Presidential Address before the American Sociological Society and found in *Papers and Proceedings, Twenty-first Annual Meeting, American Sociological Society*, Vol. XXI, p. 1 ff. This whole volume's title is "The Progress of Sociology." Therefore, let us take the situation as then existent for our jumping-off point.

From the descriptions of the situation in 1926, it is clear that some of the developments which stand out later had already appeared in their beginnings at that time. Emphasis was placed on some of the special fields of sociology, e.g., ecology, social psychology, social biology, rural sociology, social pathology, and the relation of psychiatry to social psychology. Likewise negatively, the increasing rejection of philosophic theories accepted by earlier sociologists was operating to give place to new theories growing out of an appreciation of objective research. An example of such diminution of previously important theory is that of the Darwinian "struggle for existence" and Spencer's modification of it in the doctrine of *laissez faire* applied to political and economic theory.

Moreover, from the 1860's on there had occurred the growth of a large number of different organizations concerned with the socially maladjusted. The results of World War I and the economic and political disturbances consequent on that struggle resulted in a great growth of theorizing about the sociological factors contributing to those disorders. Forty years ago there were but a few books and classes in departments of sociology in the colleges and universities on this aspect of sociology. Only a few courses and fewer schools of social work had been established. Fifty years ago I can remember only two books on the subject in English: Warner, *American Charities* (1894) and Wines, *Punishment and Reformation* (1895). The first book I used for such a class was Henderson's *Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents*, published in 1908. Contrast that with the situation at present. Grant that there is not a great deal of uniformity of theory in these writings. Nevertheless, they have unearthed a mass of material which has sociological

meaning. Thanks be that as yet there is no code of dogmatic orthodoxy in sociology. Too much still remains to be discovered by scientific research.

Another striking development of a trend the beginnings of which can be seen before forty years ago, as mentioned above in our second paragraph, is the cross fertilization between sociology and the other sciences which have a bearing on human behavior. Anthropology and sociology have increasingly borrowed from each other. Industrial sociology shows an increasing recognition between economics and sociology. The Freudian and Neo-Freudian psychiatry has had great influence on some of the sociologists, especially those interested in personal and social maladjustments, and in social work, with corresponding modification of psychiatric theory and practice. Likewise, psychology and social psychology affected many of the writers in each field. Similarly, the sociological theorists and those concerned primarily with the maladjusted have been more conscious than earlier of the bearing of the others' contributions to his own particular interest. Witness, as an example of the use of the findings of those interested primarily in maladjustment by the sociological theorists, the treatment of this material by Talcott Parsons in his recent books. On the other hand, consider the anxiety shown by the writers on maladjustment to put their material into what they have called "a frame of reference."

Another outstanding development in the last forty years is the increased evidence of the use of statistics by sociological writers. This was only one method of applying what had been learned in some of the "natural" sciences to social phenomena. It is accepted rather widely that this method has its limitations, but is a sign that increasingly sociologists are recognizing that measurement of likenesses and differences between individuals and groups throws light on the factors affecting human behavior. Its use in predicting behavior among the maladjusted has now gone far enough to show that so far its chief value has been to show that the data on which statistical methods are used must be selected more carefully. For example, see Ohlin, *Selection for Parole* (1951), and Gillin and Associates, *Predicting Criminal Behavior* (1952).

As an old man in the middle of his eighth decade of life and at the end of half a century of laboring in the field, I find myself greatly encouraged at the prospects of sociology for the future. True, it has had its childhood vagaries, but it had sound heredity. Its period of adolescence has seen it sometimes going in all directions at once, but it is getting down to solid research to ascertain the facts concerning human behavior. It is being called upon to help solve some of the serious problems of our disturbed times. It is maturing.

A FORTY-YEAR PERSPECTIVE

FRANK H. HANKINS

Smith College

In a short sketch (the editor has said "1,000 words more or less") one can give only a few impressionistic reactions to the vast changes in the sociological scene during forty years. The field has changed more during this period, so it seems, than any related discipline. The volume of literature has become so vast and specialization so necessary that one whose interests have centered in an ancillary province is certain to be ignorant of the precise developments in concept and research. In our field centers of interest, theories, textbooks, and personages obsolesce rapidly. The works of the giants of forty years ago gather dust on dark shelves, consulted only now and then by antiquarians. Unlike the old men of the Australian aborigines, we old sociologists possess not the wisdom of the gods but the naive innocence of a bygone age.

Forty years ago the basic orientation was shifting rapidly from evolutionary and biological approaches to psychological. Ward and Giddings were among the last to set forth outlines of the universal stages of cultural evolution. The idea of "progress" as implicit in evolutionary doctrine, as indeed inevitable provided man did not interfere too much with "natural forces," was under fire. Spengler's prophecies of the doom of Western culture were in the offing, as also Petrie's studies of the cycles of civilization. Organismic analogies were still popular and instinct theories much in vogue, though both were soon to be consigned to the limbo of outworn approaches. Both racial and geographical determinisms were cultivated by considerable schools and their popularity continued to rise for at least a decade.

There was, however, a rapid rise in the field of social psychology, under the lead of Ross, Ellwood, and Bernard. This field has since held the major interest, though with an unfortunate lack of integration between its sociological and its psychological practitioners. The *rapprochement* between anthropology and sociology had scarcely begun but was soon to loom large in the total picture. Today there has been an increasing trend toward integration of psychological, anthropological, and sociological efforts to formulate basic concepts and theories. Meanwhile the doctrine of a superindividual mind or group consciousness was widely discussed and rejected, though the view that society or culture is a true evolutionary emergent, something *sui generis*, still has advocates.

System building fell into disrepute, helped by many scornful remarks about "arm-chair" philosophers, but has lately been revived in a far more scientific frame of reference. Textbooks, however, that formerly usually bore the name of "principles" now usually bear less presumptuous titles. The warm debates of forty years ago regarding methodology have been resolved largely by a whole bagful of techniques, including statistics, life histories, case studies, typological constructs, social dramas, ecological maps, small group experimentation, and so on. It is still, however, not clear just what is the sociological unit of study, that is, the basic element or elements, if any, of investigation. There has been a truly phenomenal outburst of fact finding, an eager search for operational definitions, devoted efforts to clarify concepts, and a pervading fear lest one be caught making a value judgment.

It seems to be generally agreed that the research output has, on the whole, been less fruitful for a developing science than had been hoped. The reasons for this are well known. Mere collations of observations, even when carefully done and treated with statistical finesse, prove nothing. At best, they remain on the level of descriptive sociology. Hundreds of studies have merely quantified what was already known to the informed observer as a general fact. Some of these have had local uses; some may serve future historians. The increasing realization that fruitful research should be based on hypotheses to be proved or disproved has distinctly deepened research probings. It has also led to some pretentious demonstration of what was already postulated.

The multiplicity of social phenomena and the necessity of limiting the area of study, together with the desire to work with operational definitions, have led to *ad hoc* definitions which necessarily squeeze out parts of the social reality. They too often fail to produce results comparable to those of related studies, so that broader generalizations and cumulative insights are hindered. Researches have thus tended to remain on the descriptive rather than the causal explanatory level. Moreover, they have been deeply tainted, as a rule, with a marked relativity of time and place. While, therefore, enduring benchmarks have been hard to establish, one does not overlook the compensatory fact that a very distinct advance has been made in the quality of empirical studies.

The search for clear concepts has been a major concern and another indication of the definite shift from reformism to science. Some valuable new terms have been added; there has been considerable putting of old wine in new bottles. Recently there has been some flirting with psycho-analytic terms, most of them notoriously inoperational, and sometimes reminding one sharply of the instinct terminology of McDougall's era.

Some of the newest terms seem to me so confusing and elusive in meaning that one may feel quite certain they will, like Thomas's four wishes, either enjoy a brief spell of glory as the recondite language of the initiated or, like many of Lester F. Ward's neologisms, sink without a trace. Moreover, it seems to me that scarcely any of the presently mandatory terms, such as *status*, *role*, *class*, *institution*, can be precisely delimited. They are much like Ripley's races of Europe of sixty years ago, diluted by infusion of hybrid elements when subjected to operational tests. This did not prevent Ripley from setting up ideal types by means of which he was able to analyze the racial backgrounds of the peoples of Europe. The analysis of a social system is certainly not less difficult. The problem is to find equally illuminating ideal types. It is hoped that the current cooperation of psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists will produce concepts usable by all three disciplines.

Among the distinct advances of this period has been the greatly increased interest in theory. Many thanks are due here to the works of Sorokin, Barnes, the Beckers, and others who have made available valuable digests and analyses of previous contributions. Many courses in theory are still courses in the history of theories, just as some undergraduate courses are largely courses in the special lingo of the field. However, I have the distinct impression that marked advances in both types of courses have gotten well under way. The works of MacIver, Znaniecki, Ogburn, Lundberg, Parson, and Merton, among others, have given the sociological professor and student alike tougher but more nourishing provender. Analytical content replaces purely descriptive and historical materials, while at the same time research findings are becoming cumulative in some areas.

Moreover, there seems to be a considerable trend toward a wider area of general agreement as to what sociology is about and should try to do, though much confusion remains. It is no longer conceived, as it was forty years ago, as a waste basket of leftovers from the special social sciences. Nor is it conceived to be a synthesis of the latter. While a considerable wing still see it as the study of "social problems," the vast majority now see it as an abstract science whose subject matter is some conception of society, social action, or culture. While the social physicists see it as a science ultimately as precise as the physical sciences with ability to tell the social administrator how to attain desired social objectives, the majority still have considerable doubts about its predictive certainty. Most social action studies seem to me to remain within the field of social psychology, while the culturologists line up with the older philosophers of history in search for a scientized explanation of

culture cycles and changes in the culture stream. To those in more well-defined fields the sociological fraternity must look a good deal like a pack of eager hounds rushing madly about in all directions, criss-crossing each other's paths, in search of the elusive trail that will lead them out of the maze in which they are presently entrapped.

As already intimated, there persists a basic split between what are called the social action and the historical-sociological approaches, their interests, and concepts. Parsons, for example, sees personality and social system as action systems, but excludes "culture system" from that category. He defines culture as inclusive of "value systems, belief systems and systems of expressive symbols," but adds: "a culture system is not an empirical system in the same sense as a personality system, because it represents a special kind of abstraction of elements of these systems." (Parsons and Shils, eds., *Toward a General Theory of Action*, p. 55) It should be equally clear that personality and social systems are also special kinds of abstractions. Since by definition of the word *culture* the material environment is excluded, there remains only human interaction, and the system derived by abstraction therefrom depends on what one is looking for. Parsons' view limits the inquiry of basic theory to the field of social psychology, seemingly making the cultural system exclusively a product thereof.

Historically, the dominant interest of the sociological field has been the rise and fall of cultures. Sociological research seems to me likely in the long run to return to this primary interest in far larger volume than is now manifest. The basic reason for this is that the culture system dominates both personality and social systems. It gives structure to individual personality and meaning to individual behavior; it defines social roles and life objectives for the individual. It is the culture system that gives form to the social system, defines the distribution of power and the functions of constituent elements, and by its philosophical rationale gives sanction and meaning to the whole. Culture thus seems to me the action system that enables us to understand the others. Moreover, the cultural elements appear to me to be the one and only independent variable in the whole scheme of personality and social systems. Changes in it involve reconstruction of the other two.

The reasons for this view may be stated succinctly in the following analysis. There are three levels of research in this general field: (1) behavioristic psychology, (2) social psychology, and (3) culture. The first deals with the structure and functioning of the human organism as organism, its needs, innate impulses, and capacities. It is the essential basis of (2) and (3), to both of which it gives propulsion and sets

limits. It does not, however, determine the specific patterns of (2) and (3). The second level is that of social interaction, or what Giddings called, in a more expressive term, "interstimulation and response." It rests on (1), to which is added the fact of association, but the interaction always occurs in some specific setting supplied by (3). This second level is thus divisible into two parts: (2a) the contribution of (1) plus the processes of interaction viewed in the abstract and (2b) the specific cultural setting. The third level represents the results of the interplay of (2a) and (2b), so that culture systems become basic factors in their own development.

It may be emphasized here that what is internalized in the (2a) processes of personality formation are specific patterns of culture, unique exemplars of the abstract pattern common to all societies. Such an abstract pattern surely exists, representing the patterns common to all societies viewed conceptually. It is, however, the specific patterns that are studied by social scientists of all varieties. Hence, the student of the economic, domestic, or other institutions of a society finds it difficult, if not impossible, to transfer his generalizations to the like institutions of another society, unless he states them in such abstract terms as to deprive them of substantive content. The institutions of Russia, India, and the United States are so permeated with differential values, symbols, and rationales as to make each of them uniquely evolving systems of personality, social, and cultural patterns. Generalizations derived from the study of any of them are heavily relativistic in human significance.

Let us now renew discussion of the above paradigm. Let us assume, as is commonly done these days, that (1) is constant for all races and peoples at all times. Then its ingredient in (2a) also is a constant. If we view abstractly the patterns of interaction set up by association, that is, (2a) viewed in its entirety, then they also may be seen as constant, that is, common to all personality, social, and cultural systems. The variable element in all three of these systems then becomes (2b), or that form of (3) which in a given society is the setting for the processes abstracted and generalized under (2a). Hence, it would seem that culture is the one and only independent variable, even though it rests on (1) and (2a) and cannot be explained without them.

It follows also that each culture stream tends to be unique. There are many parallels and similarities, but they remain just that, since in their meanings as human values they are never quite the same. If we search for the independent variable accounting for culture change, we must find it in (3), or for any given culture in the (2b) that interacts with the generalized (2a). This culture process produces ever new

forms of culture in a deterministic culture stream. Culture is thus a true evolutionary emergent. It proliferates, sloughs off old forms, takes on new ones, and may finally leave behind only meaningless artifacts. All this results, not from changes in the universal and abstract categories of interaction, which remain the same, but from the variable impact of specific cultural elements and environmental situations on these categories as an underlying matrix.

While, therefore, we need to learn all we can about (1) and (2), there must remain some doubt as to how much further light on them will illuminate the dark future of our own culture. There is nothing new, for example, in the hereditary constitution of man, in his mental processes, or the processes of interstimulation and response viewed abstractly that will account for the countless oddities of every culture, for the current revival of religious interest, for what is called the "retreat from reason," or the drift toward collectivist values.

I wish to interject here a mild demurrer to the above dogmatic assumptions that (1) is a constant. It almost certainly is for a given people for considerable periods of time, but it is not yet proved that all races are equal in culture-producing capacities nor exactly alike in innate propensities and aptitudes. Nor can one be sure that internal selective processes and migration have no effect on the genetic composition of a population. The assumption that the numbers of men of genius of varied types and grades are uniform for all times and places seems contrary to the historical record and is clearly contrary to the pertinent theory of probabilities. Genius is a relatively rare genetic combination, and some peoples and periods seem to have unusual runs of luck. These assumptions illustrate what Goldenweiser long ago called "the social compulsive of thought." They derive from certain current social conjunctures in the racial field and the drift away from individualist toward collectivist values. They illustrate the relativity of truth and the power of the "dominant mentality" in the cultural field. However, this demurrer does not basically invalidate the above analysis. It merely leaves open some role, large or small, for variations in (1) to produce variations in (2) and (3).

The view presented above may seem to some unrealistic in that it appears to make culture self-generating and man a mere automaton caught in a superhuman culture stream. Neither criticism holds. Culture is not reified. Rather it is a conceptual abstraction from the behavior of human beings, as are concepts of personality and social system.

Nor is man a mere automaton swept along in the culture stream. While it is somewhat ambiguous to say that "man is not born human," it is true to say that as an individual specimen of the species he evolves

toward what men may become only as far and as fast as the cultural medium in which he is reared evolves from savagery to civilization. Man as human being and culture evolve together. Though originally only a wild ape-man and today born a human animal, he develops away from this inherent animalism to the extent his culture permits. Recent world events show that this has not been very far in some respects. We relapse into savagery with every serious breakdown in the cultural controls. However, in the development of culture, man must not only be present, which some "culturologists" assert is all that is needed of him; he must also act and his actions count. While his actions remain within a deterministic causal chain, through the development of scientific knowledge he gains a special kind of freedom over his environment, a type of control possible only in a fully deterministic world. Herein lies the promise of improvements in his own cultural medium. Here also is the possibility, through the development of human genetics, of making himself over, or at least preserving the genetic foundations of a complex cultural system.

However, I would not wish to be interpreted as upholding the view that the social science of the future will enable the sociologist to tell the statesman, politician, and other wielders of power how to attain their ends. This view seems to me both scientifically unsound and socially impractical. Scientifically, it assumes both a sure prediction of the effects of a social policy and power of control over the means needed to achieve a given end. Both of these seem likely to remain far short of such realization as is already possible in the physical sciences. Prediction in these latter is based on past performance and deals with relatively few variables. Nature's routines tend to repeat themselves with narrow margins of variation. Culture, on the other hand, not only has many variables but is constantly changing into something that never existed before, even when there are striking parallels. The mental processes of men of genius, their numbers, the social impact of charismatic leaders, the mass reactions to changing social conditions, and the new inventions and discoveries are none of them subject to either prediction or control within narrow limits. Changes in the ways in which men make their living inevitably carry with them changes in the value scheme and its justifying rationale. Moreover, a neatly predictive social science would not work in a society of free men, since equally able leaders would be using the same techniques for quite opposed ends. It might give greater security to absolute dictators for limited periods, but in the long run even they would be overturned by the unforeseen and uncontrolled trends of a complex social system. So it would seem that social engineering will fail

to attain that predictive power and that control over the means to ends needed to introduce the age of social telesis. This is a welcome prospect, since it retains the zest and spirit of adventure of the human epic.

As indicated above, I should not in the least discourage those seeking a basic and comprehensive set of concepts and theorems. My hat is off to them for brilliant and sustained effort. Greater cooperation between related disciplines is here a necessity and is being promoted. I sometimes wonder, however, whether abstract theory may not remain in the field of intellectual speculations and without much effect on the further evolution of the culture that produces it. Abstract theorems tend to be devoid of concrete content, while all special studies are tarred with a relativity of time and place. There may, for example, be a pattern of revolution, but those who carry out the revolutions of the future will not have heard of it, nor care. Every such overturn in the future will take place in a social and cultural setting that never previously existed and will produce changes in the distribution of power and in the sustaining philosophy of social values that were only paralleled in previous history. Middle-range theories seem likely, therefore, to have the greater explicative significance. Here much has been done relating to mass communication, class stratification, bureaucracy, small groups of various types, and other important aspects of the social totality. It may be we shall find that only such have realistic and practical value.

Finally, it would seem that the worthy effort to escape all semblance of value judgments has led to much meaningless collection of observations. Values are implicit in what one chooses to study, in the selection of data, and in whatever social significance attaches to the results. The value system is by far the most significant aspect of any social system. Together with its sanctioning philosophy or rationale (which may look like a rationalization to a future generation), that system gives structure to individual personality and the social order. It gives meaning to the lives of individuals and sets goals for the collectivity. No mechanical invention can equal in human import a change in that system, even when it is a factor in such a change.

I should like, therefore, to see more sociological effort devoted to the analysis of the causes of current value shifts. We live in what appears to be one of the great transitional periods of world history. There is all about us the utmost excitement over questions of ideology. We see the widespread adoption of an ideology that seems to us false and demonstrably so. I would not suggest that sociologists depart from their scientific objectivity by entering the political arena as partisans, but rather as seekers of explanations in understandable terms. That could keep a considerable cohort busy for some time.

TRENDS IN A HALF CENTURY OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

WILLIAM F. OGBURN

University of Chicago

In discussing the important changes in sociology since the first decade of the present century, my remarks will be impressions and not a fact-real record. I shall not avoid interpretations as I would in a scientific article, and these interpretations will show some bias of emphasis and of selection. I hope that such deviations from science will not be gross.

1. Early in the century there began a movement to abandon the attempts to make a grand system of sociology whose scope would be very broad indeed, sometimes so broad as to cover all the special social science. This abandonment arose I think because of a need for more data and because of a recognition that much systemization of ideas which went for a system of sociology was either unrealistic or unimportant.

2. Particularly was there a withdrawal from the interpretation of society in terms of biology. The defeat of biology was a victory for culture, a concept from anthropology. The victory was a rout, too much of one.

3. The need for evidence emphasized scientific research as contrasted with scholastic research. Statistics became the great tool and is the analogue of the laboratory in natural science. Nonstatistical descriptive research also increased, for in many fields of sociology statistics do not exist or are very costly in money and time to collect, or they are impossible to obtain. The march of statistics was aided by funds to finance statistical research, the cost of which is comparable to the cost of research in natural science, a fact little recognized by university administrations. The invasion of statistics led to a sort of atomization of sociology; that is, the conquests of statistical method occurred in small pockets in the expanse of the sociological area, which aroused some protest by those who with only a philosophical experience in dealing with ideas without data did not appreciate that science is an accumulation of knowledge won by research small enough to be manageable.

4. The specialization resulting from research and accumulation led to a differentiation of areas, such as population, race, crime, rural life, etc. These areas earlier were little cultivated and one sociologist could cover several, which can be done now only with the sacrifice of research that comes from specialization.

5. The area of greatest expansion has probably been in social psychology, which has been found very useful in the study of behavior in many customs and institutions. Social psychology has become more trustworthy because of the base provided by cultural sociology. Also new light has come from psychoanalysis. The contributions from psychiatry have been particularly useful in spelling out the different kinds of dangers to research that come from bias where data are inadequate.

6. At the same time, there has been a decline of interest in certain sectors of sociology, as for instance in biological sociology, in social evolution, in the history of social institutions, in the relation of geography to sociology, and in the borders of sociology and anthropology. These are regretted more than the decline in the influence on sociology of social philosophy, literature, journalism, ethics, and propaganda.

Parallel with this shrinkage in the coverage of sociology and the more intensive pursuit by large numbers of what is left has been the considerable encroachment into sociological areas by geographers, social anthropologists, political scientists, biologists, and psychologists. To these aggressive expanding disciplines retreating sociologists have yielded territory.

At the same time, there have been propaganda attempts on the part of individual sociologists and their followers to try to restrict the scope of sociology to their own particular field of specialization. Perhaps the problems of curricula appeal in colleges have had something to do with this movement to make sociology different from other social sciences.

7. In recent years, after a quiescent period, there has been a reawakening of interest in the systemization of sociological ideas, in contrast to knowledge, which it is fashionable to call theory both in economics and in sociology. Systematic organization of scope is only one kind of theory and often results from an aesthetic impulse rather than science. Theory in the sciences is much more closely related to data, as in theoretical physics, than is most social theory. Indeed, the theory that is most fruitful in science is not far removed from hypothesis. The organization of a science is, of course, of immense importance to research in that it cuts down time and error, and assists in making profitable choices of research efforts.

8. In a review of recent sociological activities, it is difficult to isolate the fluctuations around trends from the trends themselves. This is doubly difficult because sociologists, like others, are subject to the winds of fashion. And there is much fashion in ideas as well as vocabulary. Scientific development rests on continuity and accumulation. The accumulation of knowledge in sociology at the mid-century is much greater than it was at the beginning, and the methods of obtaining it are greatly improved.

NORTH AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY— FORTY YEARS OF GROWING UP

STUART A. QUEEN

Washington University

Forty years ago North American sociology was just beginning to emerge from the era of the great system makers—Ward, Giddings, Small; at least partly in this tradition, Sumner, Ross, Cooley; and presently Ellwood, Keller, Park. The men of that generation, and some of their successors, were struggling for a place in the academic sun. They were eager to prove that sociology was a science deserving recognition from university administrations and from students. In the effort to carry out their presumed mission, they asked, and tried to answer, such questions as: What is society? What are its basic processes? What are the chief causes of social behavior? Influenced by Comte, Spencer, Simmel, and other Europeans, they seemed to be driven by a great urge to produce inclusive, closed systems of ideas which might provide adequate answers to the questions they were asking.

They engaged in much speculation and very little empirical research. But, while themselves lacking the skills and tools for gathering concrete data, they encouraged their students to go forth to test the propositions set forth almost *a priori*. Sumner assembled great quantities of material from the field studies of others; Ross visited many parts of the world and gave vivid reports of his shrewd observations; Cooley made careful records of the social development of his own children. But the first three spent most of their time on the elaboration of what we might call systems of social philosophy.

Standing apart from the social theorists were others who devoted their efforts to the gathering of facts, usually to guide their fellow citizens in the conduct of practical affairs. One such group made social surveys, beginning with Pittsburgh in 1908, followed by others concerned with social work, the church, education, recreation, and other institutions. Another group, led by Galpin, sought to identify rural communities, their range of influence, the interrelations of their institutions, and the changes taking place. But the fact gatherers and the theoreticians seldom met and did not always express very high opinions of each other.

There were two respects in which sociologists of the two categories were a good deal alike: both indulged in value judgments, and both depended on intuition for the discovery of causes. Both groups condemned "evils" in the world about them—poverty, crime, immorality, in

city slums and in rural communities. Toward these their attitudes varied from Sumner's *laissez faire* to Ross's vigorous championship of the common man. The search for causes was also diverse, but tended to be impressionistic or preconceived. Ward had his classification of social forces, Small his six interests, and Giddings his consciousness of kind. In general, the students of pre-World War I days lined up in "schools" identified with the names of men already mentioned.

Today the grand system makers have almost vanished. But we still have fact gatherers who seem little concerned with social theory. However, more and more there is a convergence of empirical research and sociological generalization. We ask questions about the interrelations of income, schooling, housing, and attitudes in social stratification; about factors associated with the spread of rumors; about the ways in which intergroup relations develop and change—more limited than the wide sweep of Ward's speculation; broader in scope and more generic in character than the social surveys. Having formulated problems and hypotheses, we go out to gather relevant data to answer our questions and to test our hypotheses. Or, put the other way around, we assemble a lot of interesting facts, mull over them, and come up with new questions and new hypotheses. In other words, theorizing and research are ceasing to be two separate things.

Along with the convergence of inquiry and generalization has come a critical review of what we mean by causation. As we have seen, the men of forty years ago were still positing or seeking something "out there" that structured or guided human affairs, that pushed people around and made them what they are. McDougall had his instincts, Thomas his four wishes; any number of men argued about heredity versus environment; others put the matter in terms of social forces. But all of them found it easier to assume such energy or power than to identify or measure it. Similar difficulties were encountered by those who formulated the problem in terms of function or process. More recently we sociologists have concentrated our attention on concomitance and sequence. To test our hypotheses we utilize systematic observation, testimony of witnesses, examination of records, and occasionally true experimentation. We manipulate our data statistically, compute coefficients of correlation, chi square, and other measures of association and significant difference. Instead of expounding polysyllabic sociological laws, we are working out tentative propositions in such terms as these. If . . . , then the probability of . . . is In other words, we are dealing with probable relationships on the basis of which some prediction is possible.

The change described in the preceding paragraph indicates also what has happened to the ancient problem of determinism versus free will. Geographic, biological, economic, and other elements are no longer pitted against each other, nor against individual freedom; instead, we study the statistical relationship between these various factors and different events and conditions of group life. The individual is seen as participating in group activities which, from one angle, may be seen as cases of social control; from another, as public decision.

Finally, there have been important changes in the treatment of values. About forty years ago Hayes held that sociology should set forth the duty of a good man, point out inadequate practices, and suggest needed reforms. A little later Read Bain said that sociologists should stick to the facts and their interrelations, "with all practical and valuational interests held severely in check." More recently it has been emphasized that sociologists must study the values held by groups, learn the conditions under which they change, determine whether any of the values are mutually contradictory and which of them may be capable of realization. Sociologists ourselves proclaim certain values—objectivity, honesty, accuracy, and humility in the face of the facts. We are guided in our choice of problems by the values of our society. We try to show how results of our studies can be used practically. But we pretty generally abstain from telling people what goals they ought to pursue.

CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

PITIRIM A. SOROKIN
Harvard University

1. If we extend the period to the beginning of the twentieth century, it is marked, first, by the passing away of most of the greatest sociologists and of a large number of the eminent sociologists of the present century: G. Tarde, G. Le Bon, E. Durkheim, L. Lévy-Bühl, C. Bouglé, M. Halbwachs, G. Richard, R. Worms, M. Mauss, M. Granet, F. Simiand, H. de Tourville, E. Demolins, Lapouge, L. Weber, G. Sorel in France; O. Spengler, W. Oswald, O. Spann, W. Dilthey, M. Weber, A. Weber, G. Simmel, S. Freud, W. Sombart, K. Mannheim, F. Tönnies, M. Scheler, A. Vierkandt, K. Kautsky, H. Cunow in Germany-Austria; E. Westermarck, J. G. Frazer, L. Hobhouse, P. Geddes, B. Kidd, B. Malinowski in England; V. Pareto, F. Carli, M. Vaccaro in Italy; R. Steinmetz in Holland; P. Lilienfeld, E. de Roberty, J. Novicow, P. Kropotkin, M. Kovalevsky, N. Mikhailovsky, G. Plekhanov, V. Lenin, N. Berdyaev, L. Petrazicki in Russia; A. Posada, R. A. Orgaz in Spanish-speaking countries; E. Waxweiler in Belgium; L. Ward, W. G. Sumner, F. Giddings, C. H. Cooley, E. A. Ross, R. Park, C. Case, A. Keller, A. Small, E. C. Hayes, W. I. Thomas, C. Ellwood, F. Boas, W. MacDougall, E. Huntington, H. Odum, P. Lichtenberger in the United States; this, far from being exhaustive, list shows an enormous loss suffered by sociology during the past forty to fifty years. The list contains, indeed, most of the great designers and master builders of the most significant systems of sociology of the present century.

2. Fortunately for us, however, their creative work in the field of general, systematic sociology has been continued by the older generation of the eminent living sociologists who came to prominence at the beginning of the period considered and are still with us, continuing their significant contributions to our science.¹ F. Znaniecki, K. Jaspers, L. von Wiese, C. Gini, L. Livi, A. Toynbee, A. Kroeber, J. L. Moreno, F. S. C. Northrop, W. Ogburn, F. S. Chapin, E. Bogardus, E. Burgess, R. MacIver, L. Mumford, N. Timasheff, R. Lowie, C. Pannunzio, G. Gurvitch, G. Davy, L. Febvre, R. Lenoire, A. Bayet, I. A. Blaha, G. Freyre, L. M. y Nuñez, A. Povina, C. Leao, C. Brinkmann, F. Stepan,

¹ I am not sure that a few of these sociologists are still living.

H. Z. Ülken, P. N. Prabhu, R. Mukerjee, E. Sicard, A. M. Carr-Sanders, H. E. Barnes, M. Sorre, A. Cuvillier, Ortega y Gasset, E. Dupréel, J. Piaget, Ch. Blondel, H. Wallon, J. M. Echavarria, P. Ferreira, G. Ramos, F. Ayala, G. Myrdall, Th. Litt, H. Freyer, T. Geiger, and others represent this older generation of the living architects of the systems of general sociology. A part of these leaders continue the work of their departed *maîtres*, a smaller part have developed their own systems of sociology or cultural science.

3. The system-building work of this older generation is notably reinforced by several sociologists belonging to the age group in between this older and the younger generations of the active leaders of our science, like: T. Abel, R. Merton, H. Becker, G. Allport, C. Zimmerman, T. Parsons, P. H. Furfey, C. Mikhanovitch, C. Loomis, H. Hart, H. Jensen, L. Cottrell, Jr., M. Davie, J. Folsom, T. Lynn Smith, R. Angell, R. Bain, R. Bierstedt, H. Blumer, J. Bossart, W. Firey, W. Moore, E. F. Frazier, R. and H. Lynd, G. D. H. Cole, M. Ginsberg, M. Merleau-Ponty, R. Aron, J. Monnerot, H. Levy-Brühl, G. Friedmann, J. Maquet, R. Bastide, W. Ziegenfuss, A. Gehlen, E. Fechner, A. Hauser, A. Rüstow, R. König, W. Röpke, G. Mackenroth, A. Müller-Armack, P. Kahn, K. A. Fischer, F. Fried, A. v. Martin, Th. Bovet, H. Barth, G. Solms, C. Moraze, Levi-Strauss, M. M. Valle, Ilse Schwidetzky, J. Haesaert, D. Warnotte, and others. Though in part the studies of some of these social scientists fall within the field of special sociologies and the style of researches of the younger generation of living sociologists, nevertheless, they all have cultivated the field of general sociology and "philosophy of history."

4. Perhaps the most conspicuous change, especially in American sociology, during the period considered consists in a sharp shift of sociological research of the younger generation of sociologists from a cultivation of general systems of sociology and a study of its general problems to an "operational," "quantitative," "experimental," "precise" research of special problems of psychosocial science, including its methods and techniques. The bulk of the younger sociologists seem to have somewhat lost interest in "an arm-chair" sociology, as they call the systems of sociology of the preceding generations, and they are trying to build "a natural science sociology" as a replica of the physical sciences. In accordance with this ambition, the younger generation of researchers industriously endeavors to imitate the terminology, the concepts, the formulae of uniformities, the methods and techniques of physical and biological sciences. A part of these physicalistically inclined sociologists mix these tendencies with mechanistic, behavioristic, and Freudian patterns of biopsychological theories. S. C. Dodd, G. Lundberg, S. Stouffer,

L. Guttman, P. Lazarsfeld, C. I. Hovland, E. Suchman, N. Rashevsky, A. Rapaport, J. Q. Stewart, R. Bales, a large number of researchers of the "Small Group," the "Group Dynamics," the modern "Social Physics," "Social Cybernetics," and a still larger legion of the partisans of various "scientific" tests, beginning with the intelligence tests and ending with the projective techniques and the tests of loyalty and subversivity—not to mention the armies of the "operational," "quantitative," "experimental" sociologists—represent the bulk of this younger generation of psychosocial researchers. Today this "physicalistic-mechanistic" current of modern sociology is possibly the most voluminous in the North-American sociology. In other countries it is still only a small rivulet, but the rivulet also is swelling in its volume.

Among other things, this largest "physicalistic denomination" in today's American sociology has achieved a notable "existential" success in selling its "strictly scientific" products not only to colleges, foundations, and research institutions but also to governments, industrial corporations, and the public at large.

5. If we try to appraise the strictly scientific achievements of various streams of the period's sociological thought, my personal conclusions can be summed up as follows. (In my *Fads and Foibles of Modern Sociology and Related Sciences* and *Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis*, a considerable body of evidence for these conclusions is given.)

a. The dominant Physicalistic school has made hardly any progress in comparison with the Physicalistic-Mechanistic school of the preceding centuries (Cf. my *Contemporary Sociological Theories*, Ch. I). Like the preceding "Social Physics," "Social Mechanics," and "Social Energetics," it has failed in its commendable effort to build a "natural science sociology." Its "operational" method is a parody of the "operational method" of physical sciences; its experimental and instrumental techniques turn out to be (with a few exceptions) sham-experimental and pseudoinstrumental; its "scientific" tests are no more scientific than the age-old "tea-leaves tests," "coffee-ground tests," and most of the magic tests of the antiquity. Its attempts of a precise measurement of a legion of unscalable, qualitative phenomena have also been largely fruitless; its efforts of application of the method of "mathematical models" have yielded, at best, beautiful blueprints of resplendent sociological palaces for whose building the necessary material is lacking; its "quantification" of many a psychosocial phenomenon often resulted in either sterile "numerology" or a substitution of a homemade "shorthand" for mathematics. In general, its borrowing of terms, concepts, and formulae of uniformities from physical sciences has resulted in an atrocious distortion of the meanings they have in physics and in a littering of the

field of sociology by a debris of meaningless, disserviceable, parasitic terms, concepts, and propositions.

When stripped from the "highfalutin" terms of *precise, operational, mathematical, objective*, etc., the real method of this "physicalistic denomination" has been a very ancient and least reliable method of collection of untested and unverified "hearsay stuff": vocal or written answers of the interviewed or questionnaired respondents. Statistically processed, an unverified mass of incidental answers of largely incidental respondents to all sorts of questions of the researchers makes an overwhelming bulk of the researchers of this "denomination." Considering the extreme variability and unreliability of our speech reactions, especially when they concern our wishes, aspirations, proclivities, and hypothetical conjectures of how we would behave under a given hypothetical situation, the real scientific value of this "hearsay stuff" research turns out to be very light, purely parochial and temporary, at best the value of a snapshot which already at the moment of its publication gives a distorted picture of the respective psychosocial objective reality. Despite a noisy contention of this denomination for a particularly "objective and precise" character of its studies, it represents one of the most subjective and arbitrary currents of sociological thought.

Since its real method is of an ancient vintage, the current could not and did not discover many new important verities and has not greatly enriched the treasury of man's sociological knowledge. Most of its "revelations" have been but a rediscovery of a table of multiplication long ago discovered. A few parochial, purely temporary bits of information have been, of course, produced by our physicalistic sociologists, but in the long run most of such information does not help us much in understanding the how and why of structural and dynamic properties of human personality and the social and cultural universe.

This criticism of a pseudoscientific physicalism in sociology in no way hinders me from sincerely wishing a most intensive cultivation of the *real* experimental, mathematical, and statistical research in our discipline. Such real methods should be applied whenever and wherever their use is possible.

b. Of other currents of sociological thought during the period discussed, three appear to have been the most fruitful and creative. One is the modern cultural and historico-philosophical sociology represented, besides many a study of the specific cultural problems, by such works as O. Spengler's *Decline of The West*, A. Toynbee's *Study of History*, A. Kroeber's *Configurations of Culture Growth*, F. S. C. Northrop's

The Meeting of East and West, F. Znaniecki's *Cultural Sciences*, by several works of N. Berdyaev, Ortega y Gasset, and, perhaps to a very small degree, by my *Dynamics*. Despite their serious shortcomings, they seem to have thrown more light on basic cultural and social processes, and probably have a larger chance to survive, than most modern works in psychosocial sciences. The second fruitful current has been the psychodramatic and sociometric sociology led by J. L. Moreno, when it is freed from its physicalistic elements. The third current is still mainly in the stage of the blueprints, only partly realized in real sociological buildings. It is represented by several new systems of the "Integralist," "Existential," the "Phenomenological," "Dialectic and Hyper-Empirical" systems of sociology, trying to incorporate and integrate in themselves all the sound-empirical, mathematico-logical, and intuitional methods of cognition of many-dimensional sociocultural reality, without its fallacious simplification and distortion. These blueprinted systems of sociology notably differ from all the preceding sociological systems prevalent in the last few centuries. If these new systems are developed and their blueprints are actually realized in respective sociological buildings, they may mark a new phase in the development of a truly scientific sociology of the next decades.

COMMENTS ON CHANGES IN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY

JESSE F. STEINER

International Christian University

Since my retirement from the University of Washington about seven years ago, I have been more directly concerned with the changes taking place in Japanese sociology than with the sociological trends in America. During three recent trips to Japan, I have seen a small but courageous group of young Japanese sociologists turn aside from the earlier allegiance to European patterns of thought and blaze new trails through field studies of their own institutions. The stage of development of Japanese sociology at the present time resembles in many ways the situation that prevailed in America just prior to the First World War. At that time leading American scholars in this field had studied under German social scientists and rarely deserted their armchairs for the purpose of testing their sociological theories through inductive studies.

When I received my degree in 1915, sociology in American universities was at a low ebb. There were few openings in universities for young sociologists, and Dean Albion W. Small expressed to me so much doubt about the future growth of this field of social science that I seriously considered the advisability of studying economics, which was then enjoying much popularity. Finally, unable to secure a suitable position in my field, I reluctantly turned to social work as a temporary means of support.

But during my period of graduate study there was already going forward the transition from emphasis on speculative thought to growing interest in social research. I still remember the enthusiasm with which graduate students of the University of Chicago, under the direction of Dr. Robert E. Park and his associates, turned their attention to the city as their sociological laboratory. Their methods of investigation may at first have been somewhat crude, based more upon observation than thorough study of all the pertinent facts. But the publication of their research opened up a new vista to students of social phenomena. Under the impetus of this new movement departments of sociology expanded in an unprecedented manner during the early 1920's. Sociological courses began to be popular among both undergraduates and graduates. Subsidized by appropriations from foundations, social research became a major activity of many sociology departments.

This new emphasis upon research gradually brought to the front new interest in quantitative methods. Whereas in 1915 an elementary course in statistics was regarded as sufficient knowledge in this subject for the doctor's degree, advanced courses became mandatory. The former reliance upon documentary and case history types of materials was replaced by insistence upon statistical data. Candidates for the doctor's degree in sociology often found it necessary to become more proficient in mathematics. Sociological journals became filled with statistical articles so complicated in their methodology that they conveyed little meaning to the general reader.

Especially since the Second World War, these statistical studies, set forth in the technical language of mathematics, are now widely regarded as evidence of erudition rarely found among sociologists in the past. To this member of an earlier sociological era, it seems that the former zeal for knowledge is being lost sight of by the emphasis on methodology. Constant attention must of course be given to the creation of more efficient tools of quantitative research, but it hardly seems appropriate to fill sociological journals with technical articles of interest primarily to statisticians. Several pages of highly technical data followed by a short, concluding paragraph of findings couched in cautious terms has become a frequent type of article in our official journal. For articles of this nature other means of publication should be found.

No doubt the great advance in quantitative methods of research during the past decade is making possible new insight into problems of group behavior. Earlier methods of research too often relied on subjective judgments and led to conclusions unsupported by an adequate array of facts. The efforts of present-day scholars to utilize statistical techniques to the fullest extent possible mark an important forward step in the field of sociological investigation.

But to a sociologist of an earlier generation, this constant parading of statistical technique when reporting the results of research seems to be misplaced emphasis, or perhaps a mistaken conception of the task to be accomplished. It is very much like a builder of a house who leaves intact the scaffolding as evidence of the method used in its construction. Statistical tables and mathematical formulae may be essential in arriving at conclusions, but after they have served their purpose, they should not occupy the front of the stage. The essential facts that emerge out of the research should constitute the body of the report, and the supporting evidence should be described in sufficient detail so that it can be understood without constant reference to the statistical tables. The general failure to do this conveys the impression that methodology is of chief

importance, and the facts studied and the conclusions reached are merely an adjunct of the whole proceeding. One is led to wonder whether expertness in statistics involves loss of capacity for verbalization.

However this may be, it is certainly not true of the sociologists who produce our modern textbooks, for these have grown in length until they contain more than double the number of pages in such books a generation ago. If this means that sociological knowledge has increased to this extent, it is commendable progress of which we may well be proud. But there is also the possibility that sociologists have been influenced by the modern trend toward large texts and have expanded their materials beyond what is required for an understanding of the subjects discussed. It may not be unreasonable to conclude that the present trend is in the direction of verbosity, and the art of condensation so useful in a period of numerous publications is not being cultivated by present-day sociologists.

But as I call to mind the changes that have taken place in the field of sociology during my lifetime, I am most deeply impressed, not with developments of which I am critical, but with the great progress that has been made. No longer is sociology a new field of study with an uncertain future. No longer does a sociologist find it necessary to justify the inclusion of his subject matter in a social science curriculum. Sociology has become a widely accepted and popular field of study in American colleges and universities. To have been a participant in this remarkable development is a privilege for which I am grateful.

DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIOLOGY DURING THE PAST FORTY YEARS*

CARL C. TAYLOR
U.S. Department of Agriculture

To my mind, the two great developments that have taken place in sociology in the last forty years are that social theory has become less philosophical and historical and more conceptual in a scientific sense, and that empirical research has become dominant in the so-called findings of sociology. Both of these developments have made sociology more useful in that it is no longer social cosmology or mere charitology, criminology, and so forth. Its concepts are, for the most part, employed to reveal the significance of the obvious—which all social facts are in their crude manifestations—and research findings are no longer “ologies” but solid bodies of validated and, for the most part, useful and usable knowledge.

Some of the connoisseurs of each of these two wings of development have gone off the deep end. What some theorists call “concepts” may be, granting their assumptions, logical but probably will prove fairly useless. Some connoisseurs of research methodology have become so enamored with the techniques of quantitative analysis that they lose sight of the fact that their findings should be built into sociology rather than used to prove mathematics.

In addition to these two broad developments, the whole field of social psychology has developed within the last forty years. Specialized studies in the fields of urban and rural life have developed. Research on levels and standards of living have developed. significant findings. Quite recently the significance of good research in small groups has developed. There has not been an adequate development of a synthesis of the methods of cultural anthropology and sociology, a thing much to be desired.

Quite generally overlooked is the tremendously significant fact that tens of thousands of students are now taking sociology courses in colleges and universities. There is probably inadequate recognition on the part of professional sociologists that few of these students are interested in studying sociology as a science. They take the course in order to become enlightened human beings. The tremendous development in the science

*Editor's note: This statement was dictated by Professor Taylor while traveling in India under the auspices of the Ford Foundation as a rural sociology consultant.

of sociology contributes to making the courses which these students take a sound body of knowledge. There is not adequate recognition of the fact that it is understanding of human groups, human society, and its problems that they desire rather than preachments concerning either concepts or research techniques.

Sociologists need to worry about another fact, viz., that they are not often called upon to render advice, counsel, and guidance on social policy. When they are called upon and used, they are very often not designated as professional sociologists but as administrators, statisticians, or economists. Economists, political scientists, social psychologists, and even psychologists are called upon by policy- and program-making bodies. Apparently, even the fruitful development of the past forty years still leaves us classified somewhat as esoteric intellectuals.

IMPORTANT CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY SINCE 1900*

LEOPOLD VON WIESE
University of Cologne

It is now exactly fifty years ago that I was able to publish my work "The Foundation of Social Theory."¹ It was my dissertation for admission to the faculty of the University of Berlin. This book was based on a very thorough study, extending over a period of years, of the works of Herbert Spencer. In order to become a critic of the teachings of the master, I had at the same time to examine the accepted sociological literature of that period. As a result, my book may serve today as a kind of commentary on the status of our knowledge at the beginning of the century. In America, Lester F. Ward and William Graham Sumner were still living. The former was attempting to proceed by way of Spencer's biological, monistic concept to a more psychological position.

Sumner's position was closer to that of the Briton and stressed moreover, through his insight in "folkways and mores," the anthropological relationship between primitive culture and modern civilization. Small's *General Sociology* had just appeared; shortly before that, Cooley's *Human Nature and the Social Order*. In Germany, Albert Schäffle's *Structure and Life of the Social Body* was already almost forgotten. On the other hand, Toennies' *Community and Society* was at last receiving attention. Georg Simmel's *Philosophy of Money* strongly attracted some readers; his *Sociology* did not appear until 1908.

If one surveys the uncertainties of the first decade of this century, it is worthy of note how hotly the relation of sociology to the natural sciences, especially biology, was debated. More particularly, the question which was much under discussion since the time of Spencer and Lilienfeld was whether sociology should accept the biological concept of the organism and whether society was to be interpreted as organic. From the philosophical point of view, the contrast between determinism and indeterminism occupied the foreground.

Differences of opinion existed concerning the relation of the individual to the universal society. In France, the contrast between Gabriel Tarde's individualist-psychological mode of thought and Emile Durkheim's

*The Journal is especially indebted to Ruth Baker Day, assistant professor of German emeritus, University of Southern California, in meeting our wish for a fairly free translation of the manuscript by Leopold von Wiese.

¹ Cf. Leopold von Wiese, *Sur Grundlegung der Gesellschaftslehre (Eine kritische Untersuchung von Herbert Spencer's System der synthetischen Philosophie)*, (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1906).

sociology had reached its height. The question was raised whether the individual was the unit of society or the family, as Comte had taught, or the pair, as Worms held. What significance do the instincts hold for social life and what does the will? Still absolutely predominating was the idea of evolution as the basic category, which was interpreted, generally speaking, especially under the influence of Spencer and Darwin, as higher development, that is, a continually progressive movement.

What was lacking? Still completely under the influence of the idea that there were two antithetically opposed substances regarded as subjects—on the one hand the individual, on the other society—it was now a question of explaining the relation of these two sociological concepts [power complexes] to each other. To be sure, the idea had already been suggested, but hardly accepted, that society has a verbal character, that it is not a substance but a chain of events, of processes. Consequently, it was by no means clearly seen as yet that the individual human being cannot be regarded as an element of a so-called gigantic, compound substance named society, but simply as a living being which stands in countless relationships to other human beings and groups of beings. These relationships are caused partly by him and partly exerted upon him by the others. It was still by no means clear that these interrelated processes and their consequences were subjects of sociology. In regard to the above-mentioned work by Spencer, I had not yet sufficiently freed even myself from the idea that the individual is the basic element of society, although it was directly due to the aforementioned study of Spencer that the path was cleared for me to the theory of the social processes as the elemented procedures, the accumulation of which first created the fictitious [hypothetical] concept of a "substance society." To be sure, Spencer himself still advocated the idea: here the individual, there society! It is the starting point of his anthropology—except that he, unlike Comte, did not consider society as the concrete and the human being as the abstract, but he had fallen prey to the opposite interpretation.

In the following decades, however, the more one dropped the old disastrous antithesis between man and society, the more it was shown that in this very antithesis were rooted most of the errors or exaggerations. Indeed, right up to the present time one has frequently resisted the drawing of logical conclusions for politics and ethics from the wreckage of pagan society. To personify it, namely, society, was for some natures just too enticing. A person could after all, in the name of the earthly deity Society, express all possible demands which he thought he had to make of his fellowmen. Only gradually was it perceived that

a theory of the web of interrelationship between human beings can serve absolutely as the basis for strict demands. This, however, requires a more rigorous, less voluntary burden of proof.

Another change in sociological thinking consists in the vanishing or disappearance of the optimistic idea of evolution. Evolution has become "social change." That the social world constantly changes in many respects (though not in all) and that these changes must be observed and judged is today as then, *communis opinio* [consensus]. We have, however, become much more careful and restrained in the interpretation and evaluation. Even the word *evolution*, which was used so frequently fifty years ago, has become quite rare.

On the whole, speculation and the attempt to interpret and evaluate the universe of societal events as one great, unified totality have decidedly declined as over against the observance of individual deeds or facts. At that time sociology was still a field of philosophical hypotheses, of initial attempts to classify the entire societal world under one great universal law or under only a few conflicting universal laws. Today skepticism has seized the upper hand to a dangerous degree, a skepticism which asserts that society cannot be systematically grasped as a unit. One frequently takes refuge in statistical proofs and inquiries, which, however, afford but small perception of the essential nature of our human life and belong rather to the technique of social interaction. That again will soon be overtaken and outdistanced. From the old masters, who fifty years ago stood in the vanguard and who still had the courage to create systems, we can learn much that concerns the pursuit of knowledge; we shall, however, on the other hand, be obliged to leave behind much which is now obsolete [or, is now bypassed].

SOME IMPORTANT CHANGES IN SOCIOLOGY DURING THE PAST FORTY YEARS

KIMBALL YOUNG
Northwestern University

The period covered by this discussion ranges approximately from the First World War to the present period of the cold war. To me there appear to be at least four significant changes in our field during these four decades. Without attempting to establish a preferential order of importance, I note the following:

1. There has been a distinctive growth in the use of quantitative methods and a corresponding decline in the use of the case-method approach. In the period 1915 through 1930 the case-method approach in research might be said to dominate sociology. This was the period which was marked by the publication of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918-1920) by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki. This monumental monograph was long regarded as the highlight of empirical research in our field.

Beginning in the early 1930's, there was a gradual shift to the use of quantitative methods. First of all, sociology began to take over the field of demography—a field distinctly oriented to quantification. Then too, I believe that the publication of the two-volume work *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (1933), which was a "Report of the President's research committee on social trends," through its extensive use of descriptive statistics had some influence in stimulating the use of quantitative analysis of sociological data.

An additional factor which encouraged experimental design and statistical treatment was the expansion of research in social psychology through the use of questionnaires on mass data. The publication in 1931 of *Experimental Social Psychology* by the Murphys—although the orientation was from psychology—serves as a bench mark of the growing interest in quantification. From then on, both sociologists and psychologists working in the field of social psychology put increasing emphasis upon quantification and less and less emphasis upon the case method. In a way, John Dollard's *Criteria for Life History* (1935) serves to witness the end rather than the inception of major concern with the case method.

Since 1940 the expansion of statistical treatment of sociological data has gone on apace not only in demography and social psychology but in the fields of social organization, the family, and elsewhere.

2. A second change has been from armchair theorizing to attempts to link theory and empirical research. While the day of the Grand Theory has passed, well-trained sociologists have come more and more to recognize the importance of designing their research in such a way as to test particular aspects of systematic theory. Robert M. Merton's papers—conveniently brought together in *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1949)—represent a sound contribution to this topic. Yet theory in the grand manner is not entirely dead.

3. I detect a certain shift in what is considered important content areas of sociology. This is probably partly a function of shifts in our national economy and way of life. Discussions of problems of immigration and assimilation have practically disappeared with a few exceptions as in the case of Mexican migrant labor. On the other hand, the area broadly conceived as social structure has been greatly expanded. The topics race relationships, juvenile delinquency, and criminology continue to interest sociologists largely because these three fields derive from three areas of our national life which we regard as showing serious disorder. As indicated above in another connection, with all of these there has been an expansion of courses in methodology and statistics, itself a correlate of the increase in quantitative research.

4. Finally, a word might be said about the shift in the professional interests of the younger generation of sociologists. Two features may be mentioned. First, as an outcome of the heavy stress on research, many of our younger Ph.D.'s regard teaching as far less important than the conduct of research. While concern with research is highly laudable, it seems to me that in the long pull we cannot neglect our obligations as teachers.

The second point is not unrelated to the first. I detect a growing tendency to abandon concern with the historical aspects of our field. More and more our graduate students and young Ph.D.'s take a strong ahistorical position, not only with reference to the history of sociological theory but with reference to the historical aspects of their own specialties. This came home to me forcefully at a recent Ph.D. examination in the field of population, where it became apparent that the candidate—a very able person indeed—not only was colossally ignorant of the history of population theory and research, but, moreover, took a lofty position that these matters were of no import. So long as we are dealing with human society and its culture, it seems to me that we cannot completely ignore the historical dimension in much of our research as well as many of our content courses. In this matter sociology, like cultural anthropology, has its roots in the past, and to ignore origins and developmental sequences is to neglect significant bodies of social data.

IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIOLOGY

FLORIAN ZNANIECKI
University of Illinois

During the last forty years sociologists have been increasingly co-operating with cultural anthropologists, archeologists, and historians. One result of this cooperation has been recognition of the vast diversity of past and present cultures, of which neither Comte nor Spencer was aware. We now face a fundamental problem: What kind of generalizations can be drawn from a comparative analysis of these cultures?

Although during recent decades methods of natural science have been widely applied to human behavior, and quantitative generalizations, based on statistical techniques, are at present extremely popular, there has arisen a substantial belief that cultural phenomena in general must be studied as they are experienced not only by outside observers but by those who produce and maintain them. And this belief is applied to the study of all kinds of social phenomena, but particularly to the study of social groups, the most important components of human collectivities.

The idea has grown that social groups are cultural systems and that they are dynamic, not static systems, inasmuch as their relations are continually changing. New varieties of organized, long-lasting social groups (or "associations") are evolving all the time and becoming functionally differentiated and integrated into complex societies.

If we survey the chief books published by sociologists, European and American, we find that they are investigating four main categories of societies:

1. *Political societies*, composed of political parties and a rapidly growing number of specialized governmental and military groups. In the United States these groups have multiplied at least three times during the last twenty-five years.

2. *Ecclesiastical societies*, composed of groups of believers organized and integrated under the guidance of the priesthood. Studies of such groups fall under the term "sociology of religion," and they are gradually expanding on a world-wide scale.

3. *National culture societies*, increasingly numerous and diverse, composed of specialized groups tending to develop and expand distinctive components of their secular literary cultures.

4. *Economic societies*, including a vast multiplicity and diversity of productive groups which are partially integrated in Western countries, but most fully in the Soviet Union.

Students of these societies investigate not only the conflicts between them but also, especially in recent times, their cooperation.

Other important new problems concern historical evolution in specific realms of culture. Sociologists have discovered that their evolution has been brought about by the creative innovations of individual leaders¹ and that it has resulted in the growth of numerous new, functionally different, organized groups. In contrast to the school of Durkheim, quite a few sociologists in using historical material concentrate on the original contributions to social life and culture made by individuals performing the social role of leaders. In studying social roles in general, emphasis is being put on the social role of the individual in a group.

Although sociologists are well aware of the vast number of social problems awaiting solutions, it has become clear that sociology cannot be made subservient to practical ends without losing its validity and its usefulness. The view is growing that in helping to solve a social problem sociology may treat it as an experiment in which some sociological theory or hypothesis is being tested or which may lead to a new hypothesis.

Finally, we may mention that, since the domain of social research is becoming increasingly wide and complicated, new special branches of sociology (besides sociology of religion) have recently developed—sociology of knowledge, of literature, of art, of education, and of industry.

¹ Cf. E. Bogardus, *Leaders and Leadership* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934).

HISTORY OF THE PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

GEORGE M. DAY

Professor of Sociology Emeritus

Occidental College

The organization meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society was held in Los Angeles in October 1929. A small group was called together by Professor E. S. Bogardus of the Department of Sociology, University of Southern California, and the following persons attended and participated in the writing of the Constitution and in planning for meetings (alphabetically arranged): Bogardus, U.S.C.; Day, Occidental; Henley, Whittier; Ketchum, Pasadena College; Kirk, Pomona; Morokvin, U.S.C.; Neumeyer, U.S.C.; Newlin, Fullerton Junior College; Nordskog, U.S.C.; Osborn, University of Redlands; and Youngman, U.S.C.

As stated in the Constitution, the object of this organization is to promote both sociological research and the teaching of sociology in the Pacific area. The society planned to encourage investigation and research in the theoretical and practical phases of sociology and social work and to promote the teaching of sociology in universities, colleges, junior colleges, and high schools.

The members of the above small but sociologically alert group agreed that they had gone their separate ways long enough in their respective institutions. They agreed with the late Earle E. Eubank, who said: "Where there is contact of human minds, there association exists; where there is no contact, there is a state of isolation."¹ So the above charter members of the Pacific Sociological Society proceeded without delay to illustrate one of sociology's most basic concepts, "social interaction." Sutherland and Woodward define *social interaction* as "that dynamic interplay of forces in which contact between persons and groups results in a modification of the behavior of the participants."² While the sociologists in the small colleges of Southern California looked up with admiration to those of the sister universities (by this time U.C.L.A. had become an integral part of the sociological society), the nationally

¹ Earle E. Eubank, *The Concepts of Sociology* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1932), pp. 289, 290.

² Robert L. Sutherland and Julian L. Woodward, *Introductory Sociology*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1948), p. 624.

known sociologists of the larger institutions were surprised and pleased to discover sociologists of worth, if not so well known, in the small, private, independent colleges.

At this juncture it should be stated that Dr. Bogardus very logically pointed out to the other "founding fathers" that our infant sociological society was worthy and strong enough to embrace the colleges and universities of northern California: Mills College, University of California at Berkeley, and Stanford University. When invited to join the new organization these three institutions accepted the offer with alacrity. Dr. Bogardus' next query was: "Why not push on to the Pacific Northwest and into Canada?" Yes, why not? The University of British Columbia was on the sociological map, the University of Washington had an exceptionally strong Department of Sociology and still has, and the University of Oregon was not far behind. Willamette and Linfield were favorably disposed. Thus in time, extending the whole length of the West Coast and eastward to include Idaho, Utah, and Arizona, the Pacific Sociological Society lived up to its name.

It was originally decided to hold three meetings a year: one in January to be known as the "Annual Meeting," one in the spring, and one in the summer at which "visiting professors" of sociology would be invited to speak. At the organization meeting the following officers were elected: president, E. S. Bogardus; vice-president, William Kirk; secretary-treasurer, L. D. Osborn. George M. Day was appointed chairman of the first program committee; Martin H. Neumeier, chairman of the first membership committee.

The first name chosen was the Pacific Southwest Sociological Association, but this was changed one year later to the Pacific Sociological Society. The first Annual Meeting was held on January 25, 1930, in Los Angeles with headquarters at the Alexandria Hotel. A half dozen reports on research topics were given and the first president's address dealt with "Tools in Sociology." Other speakers at this initial Annual Meeting were William Kirk, L. D. Osborn, Erle F. Young, W. S. Hertzog, and John E. Nordskog. At the first summer meeting, held at the University of Southern California in July 1930, John L. Gillin of the University of Wisconsin spoke on "Recent Trends in Sociology."

The major papers read at the Annual Meetings of the Society were published in the *Journal of Sociology and Social Research* at the University of Southern California, for the first ten years. Beginning with 1939, the papers have been annually published in the *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*.

Beginning in 1934, the place of holding the Annual Meetings was no longer limited to Southern California but began to include northern California, Oregon, and Washington. With extending of the area of holding meetings, the date of holding the Annual Meetings was changed from January to the preceding December of each year, during the holidays. This procedure was changed in 1946, and the Annual Meeting was moved forward to April of that year and of subsequent years. The reason for the change was to allow members to attend the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Society, which at that time were being held during the holidays. Prior to 1946 the Northern, Southern, and Central Divisions of the Pacific Sociological Society were holding spring meetings in addition to the Annual Meeting. Occasionally, Division meetings have been held, following the moving forward of the date of the Annual Meeting from December to April.

During World War II the Society maintained its main functions with the exception of the Annual Meetings. Presidents and other officers were elected, presidential addresses and other papers were written, and an Annual Proceedings appeared.

Also, beginning with 1934, healthy competition, warm cooperation, a minimum of conflict, generous accommodation on the part of all participants and a gradual, fine assimilation rounded out the processes of social interaction. Our Pacific Sociological Society is far from a perfect, finished product. More institutions have joined. The Annual Meetings are highly stimulating and well attended. The fellowship is cordial and rewarding. The quality of research and the excellence of teaching in all sociology departments from San Diego State College to the University of British Columbia are of high caliber. We salute our flourishing and growing Pacific Sociological Society. May it move on to still greater achievement!

A list of the dates of all the Annual Meetings, the places of meeting each year, the titles of the Presidents' Addresses, the names of the Presidents will now be given in order that the Society's general frame of reference may be available for ready and future reference.

1. January 25, 1930. Hotel Alexandria, Los Angeles. President's Address, "Tools in Sociology," Emory S. Bogardus.
2. January 17, 1931. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. President's Address, "Balance in Leadership," Emory S. Bogardus.
3. January 23, 1932. Pomona College, Claremont. President's Address, "An Approach to Sociological Research," William Kirk.
4. January 14, 1933. Whittier College, Whittier. President's Address, "Technocracy and Social Engineering," Clarence M. Case.

5. January 12, 13, 1934. University of California at Los Angeles. President's Address, "Races and Cultural Oases," George M. Day.
6. December 28, 29, 1934. Occidental College, Los Angeles. President's Address, "Social Science and Societal Planning," Constantine Panunzio.
7. December 27, 28, 1935. Mills College, Oakland. President's Address, "American Intellectuals and Social Reform," Howard Woolston.
8. December 28-30, 1936. University of Oregon, Eugene. President's Address, "Sociology and Social Reform," Charles N. Reynolds.
9. December 28-30, 1937. Pomona College, Claremont. President's Address, "The Sociologist and the Public," George B. Mangold.
10. December 28-30, 1938. University of California, Berkeley. President's Address, "Status of Status," Samuel H. Jameson.
11. December 27-29, 1939. State College of Washington, Pullman, and University of Idaho, Moscow. President's Address, "The Role of Intelligence in Human Affairs," Glenn Hoover.
12. December 27, 28, 1940. Stanford University, California. President's Address, "Leisure: A Field for Social Research," Martin H. Neumeyer.
13. December 29, 30, 1941. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. President's Address, "A Sociologist Looks at War," Jesse F. Steiner.
14. The December 1942 Annual Meeting was not held because of the war. President's Address by Elon H. Moore on "The Social Functions of War" and other papers were published in the Annual Proceedings.
15. The December 1943 Annual Meeting not held. President's Address by Glen E. Carlson on "Human Relations in Forestry" and other papers appear in Annual Proceedings.
16. The December 1944 Annual Meeting not held. President's Address by William C. Smith on "Sociologists, What Now?" and other papers appear in Annual Proceedings.
17. April 19, 20, 1946. San Jose, California. President's Address, "Race Relations on the Pacific Coast," Ray E. Baber.
18. May 15-17, 1947. Agate Beach, Oregon. President's Address, "Some Remarks on Sociological Theory and Sociological Research," Calvin F. Schmid.
19. April 29, 30, 1948. Santa Barbara College. President's Address, "Sociology on the Perspective of a Quarter-Century," Richard T. LaPiere.
20. April 15, 16, 1949. San Jose, California. President's Address, "Empirically Tested Principles of Social Behavior," Harvey J. Locke.
21. April 21, 22, 1950. University of Washington, Seattle. President's Address, "Human Values: A Research Program," George A. Lundberg.

22. April 20, 21, 1951. University of California, Berkeley. President's Address, "Toward a Cumulative Social Science," Leonard Broom.
23. April 4, 5, 1952. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. President's Address, "Two Conceptions of the Relations Between Love and Idealization," Paul Wallin.
24. August 31, September 1, 1953. University of California, Berkeley. President's Address, "Can the Social Sciences Serve Two Masters?—An Answer Through Experimental Sociology," Stuart C. Dodd.
25. April 22, 23, 1954. Oregon State College, Corvallis. President's Address, "The Alleged Social Class System in the United States," Robert E. L. Faris.
26. April 22, 23, 1955. Santa Barbara College, University of California. President's Address, "Sociologists, Specialists, and Students," Charles B. Spaulding.
27. April 20, 21, 1956. Stockton, College of the Pacific. President's Address, "Filipino Identification with American Minorities."

FORTY YEARS OF "SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH"

EMORY S. BOGARDUS
University of Southern California

I

Sociology and Social Research had its origins in September 1916 in the *Sociological Monographs*, edited by the writer and published four times a year under the auspices of the new Department of Sociology of the University of Southern California. Each of these quarterly publications presented a digest of a piece of sociological research prepared chiefly by a graduate sociology student in the Department. They were financed by the sociological society of the Department. It was believed that a quarterly publication would give capable graduate students a deserved recognition and a stimulus to conduct further and better research.

Some of the subjects treated in the quarterly monographs were as follows: The Teaching of Sociology in High Schools, The Russians in Los Angeles, The Japanese in Rural Los Angeles County, Causes of Fatal Accidents in Los Angeles, Causes of Truancy Among Girls, Causes of Truancy Among Boys, Social Thought in the Current Short Story. While all were pilot or pathfinder studies, they disclosed an emphasis on research in sociology; all have some merit today as basis for comparisons with current studies in the given fields, and hence for throwing light on certain aspects of social change.

In October 1921 this quarterly publication became a bimonthly one in order to provide more space for the studies of graduate students in sociology and for the publication of papers by sociologists generally. The title of the publication was changed to *Journal of Applied Sociology*, and was derived from the use of the term *applied sociology* by Lester F. Ward, who gave the following definition: "Applied sociology is not government or politics, nor civic or social reform. It does not itself apply sociological principles, it seeks only to show how they may be applied."¹ The aim of the *Journal* was the publication of research results that could be applied. Among the research articles by graduate students of the Department of Sociology (S.C.) appeared those on topics such as these: A Study of Social Conditions in Peking, China; The Employment of Children in Motion Pictures; A Study of Delinquency Among

¹ Lester F. Ward, *Applied Sociology* (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1906), pp. 9, 10.

School' Girls; Scales for Grading Social Conditions; Mexican Population of Pasadena, California; A Study of Parental Inadequacy; Social Attitudes of Chinese Immigrants.²

The plan to welcome articles in the Journal by sociologists in general met with a ready response. In the first volumes appeared articles by well-known sociologists, such as George Elliott Howard, *An Experiment in Cooperative Social Research*, VI: 3:21-25; F. Stuart Chapin, *The Socialized Classroom*, VI: 3:1-13; Frank W. Blackmar, *A Justifiable Individualism*, VI: 1:3-16; Charles A. Ellwood, *Modifiability of Human Nature and Human Institutions*, VII: 229-37; Hornell Hart, *Research Possibilities with a Socialization Test*, VII: 163-66; E. B. Reuter, *Sex Distribution in the Negro and Mulatto Population*, VII: 130-38; Ernest W. Burgess, *The Trend of Sociological Research*, VIII: 131-40; Robert E. Park, *A Race Relations Survey*, VIII: 195-205; Albion W. Small, *Some Researches into Research*, IX: 3-11 and 98-107 (this is one of the last articles written by Dean Small); Franklin H. Giddings, *Carriers of Criminality*, X: 1-5 (one of the last papers written by Professor Giddings).

Not only did prominent sociologists contribute important articles for publication but they showed a tangible and ongoing interest in the Journal by becoming advisory editors. Of the first fifteen of these advisory editors twelve are no longer living. The original list was as follows: Blackmar, Burgess, Chapin, Cooley, Dealey, Eaves, Ellwood, Giddings, Hayes, Howard, Lichtenberger, Peters, Ross, Small, and Steiner (J. F.).

II

An important development regarding the Journal in its second decade was its absorption in the *Bulletin of Social Research*, which had been established by the Department of Sociology (S.C.) a few years earlier. At this time, September 1927, the present title of *Sociology and Social Research* was adopted. The number of pages per issue was increased for each of the bimonthly issues. The emphasis on social research was augmented. Social research was referred to as involving "the synthetic use of statistics, case studies, culture pattern analyses, community approaches, social attitude analysis, and personality analysis."³ Anything less would be partial social research. In the full sense of the term, social research would include the application of an appropriate combination of methods and techniques to a given problem.

² Chosen from the first two volumes (VI and VII) of the *Journal of Applied Sociology* (1921-22 and 1922-23).

³ Frances S. Lucas, "Editorial Announcement," *Sociology and Social Research*, XII: 81.

The staff of the Department of Sociology continued to serve, as in the previous years, in editorial capacities, with the writer of this article as editor in charge and with Professors Clarence M. Case, Melvin J. Vincent, Erle F. Young, Frances S. Lucas, Martin H. Neumeyer, and Bessie A. McClenahan as associate editors (see inside of front cover, Volume XII). The staff joined in evaluating manuscripts for publication, in reviewing books, and in class presentations and discussions of the contents of articles.

Once more the scope of the Journal was increased. It was announced that "increased attention will be given to the publication concerning social life and processes in many different parts of the world."⁴ In keeping with this announcement, a subtitle appeared on the cover page of the September-October 1927 issue of *Sociology and Social Research* as follows: An International Journal.

This international interest was supported by the addition of a number of advisory editors to the group already named, from other parts of the world, as follows:

Romanzo C. Adams, University of Hawaii
Carl A. Dawson, McGill University
Leonard T. Hobhouse, University of London
Chiang Liu, St. John's University
Radhakamal Mukerjee, Lucknow University
G. S. H. Roussouw, Transvaal University College
Andreas Walter, University of Hamburg
Florian Znaniecki, University of Poznan

Articles began to appear at once in keeping with an increased stress on both social research and international themes, for example: R. Mukerjee (India), Social Ecology of a River Valley, XII: 341-47; F. Znaniecki (Poland), Social Research in Criminology, XII: 307-22; S. G. Pandit (India), Mother India's Answer, XII: 535-42; L. H. A. Geck (Germany), Social Psychology in Germany, XIII: 504-16; C. C. Hahn (Korea), Asiatic Civilization in Transition, XIII: 566-71; Leonard S. Hsu (China), Population Problems in China, XIII: 426-34. These articles and related ones appearing in the subsequent volumes of the Journal give meaning to the established editorial policy of viewing sociology, not chiefly as an American social science, but as presenting social data from various regions of the earth in order to help sociology become a social science of mankind as a unitary whole.

From the establishment of the first chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta, the sociology honor society, by the Department of Sociology (S.C.) in the fall of 1920, the society has been one of the staunchest supporters of the Journal.

⁴ Lucas, *ibid.*

Because of its basic aim, social research for the purpose of service, it was natural that the Alpha Chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta should become the Journal's leading sponsor. This interest took a substantial and greatly appreciated turn when in the thirties it began to accumulate small gifts as an "Endowment Fund for the Journal of *Sociology and Social Research*." Each year the chapter and some of its members have contributed modest gifts. As of January 1, 1956, the Endowment Fund had reached the sum of \$8,594.83, and it continues to grow: it serves to give permanent financial support to the Journal. It is administered without charge by the University of Southern California.

The second decade of the Journal's history included the Depression years of the thirties. While these were lean financial years for the Journal, yet its issues appeared each two months and on time, and its subscribers continued to show unabated interest. Problems growing out of the Depression began to receive space in the form of research articles, such as these: The Employment of Workers in the Relief Population, An Experiment in Making Social Predictions, Griffen, XIX: 555-61; The Self-Help Cooperatives and Their Effect on Labor, Kerr, XIX: 364-75; Unemployed Men in Shelters, Locke, XIX: 420-28; Objectives of Work Relief Programs, Carlson, XX: 352-58; Relief and Resultant Attitudes, Vincent, XX: 27-33.

During this decade the editorial staff was strengthened by the addition of G. B. Mangold and J. E. Nordskog; later by H. J. Locke and E. C. McDonagh; and recently by G. Sabagh and R. A. Ellis.⁵

III

In its third decade, *Sociology and Social Research* increased both its research and international emphases. A volume taken from the shelf at random, Volume 22, 1937-38, contains the following articles: The Aboriginal Family in Northern Australia, Kirk, 312-18; Social Thought of Han Fei, Chen, 340-46; The Turkish Stereotype, Meyering, 112-23; Masaryk as Sociologist, Roucek, 412-20; Sociology in Holland, Von Schmid, 103-111.

This decade of the Journal's history includes the years of World War II. Wartime studies are reported in a sample volume, Volume XXVII, 1942-43, as follows: The Adjustment of College Men to Military Life, Cuber, 267-76; Radio in Wartime, Neumeyer, 95-105; The Impact of War on Personality Organization, Znaniecki, 171-80; Sociology as a Stabilizer of Personality in Wartime, McClenahan, 3-11; The Commercialization of Patriotism in Wartime, Christensen and Green, 447-52. During the War, the Journal was interested in helping

⁵ Other persons who have served on the editorial staff for limited periods of time are C. E. Rainwater, W. C. Smith, H. G. Duncan, Alice Fesler, Mary B. Kellogg, and Frances S. Lucas.

to develop a morale that would be of assistance to the United States in its struggle against totalitarianism and in favor of fair play and social justice.

Beginning in this decade, the authors who have contributed papers to the Journal have had their articles listed regularly in the *International Index to Periodicals* (The H. W. Wilson Company). In recent years abstracts of articles in the Journal have been published regularly in the *Periodical Abstracts* of the American Sociological Association and also in the *Sociological Abstracts* (New York) since this publication was established in 1951. These services have been rendered without cost to the Journal and are deeply appreciated.

IV

The fourth decade of the Journal's history, coming to a close with this issue, covers the post-World War II years and the beginning of the atomic age. Research studies made throughout the nations of the world supplement many studies in the United States as illustrated by the following titles: Social Distance and Social Change in the Near East, Prothro and Melikian, 37: 3-11; Bureaucracy and British Socialism, Montague, 37: 164-68; Cooperatives in Finland, Owen, 37: 230-35; Social Progress in Eastern Canada, Arsenault, 38: 392-400; Social Distance in the Philippines, Catapusan, 38: 309-12; Cooperative Movement in Israel, Viteles, 38: 22-25; Race Relations in South Africa, Williamson, 39: 165-70; World Population Trends, Hauser, 39: 73-80; Sociology as a World-wide Social Science, Bogardus, 39: 409-14.

At the present time about 40 per cent of the manuscripts submitted are accepted for publication. The merit of the papers, an acceptable length, the amount of space available, and the degree to which manuscripts fit into publication plans for forthcoming issues are the main factors in determining what papers will be published. Of the 60 per cent that are not accepted, about one half are considered publishable, but space has not been available.

In the current year, as in the past and as may be expected, California leads in the number of subscribers to *Sociology and Social Research*, with the next ten states in descending order being New York, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Washington, and Tennessee. Of the foreign countries Japan heads the list, the next ten countries in descending order being India, Canada, Brazil, France, Sweden, West Germany, Mexico, Philippines, Australia, and Egypt.

V

Throughout the four decades the Journal has published news notes in each issue. These have been brief and have specialized on items of interest to sociology teachers and students in the Pacific Coast area of

the United States. Beginning with Volume 38, the editor of the *Notes* has been Edward C. McDonagh of the regular staff of the Department of Sociology (S.C.).

Beginning in the first decade with Volume IX and continuing without interruption to the present, a Social Drama and Social Fiction section has appeared under the direction of and containing the contributed reviews of Melvin J. Vincent, a member of the staff of the Department of Sociology (S.C.) since 1921 (and its head for eight years). In these reviews the aim is to offer critical notes dealing with the social problems that are exposed. For the last decade Dr. Vincent has also written an annual review of labor changes in the United States. The Journal has had as managing editors William C. Smith, Clarence M. Case, and Martin H. Neumeyer, who is the current head of the Department of Sociology.⁶

During the forty years of its history, *Sociology and Social Research* has published over 1,500 different articles. As a result of a classification whereby each article has been counted in that class in which its major emphasis belongs, social theory claims 269 articles; race and culture, 197; personality and leadership, 143; social research, 117; social disorganization, 87; the family, 85; group and community, 72; social education, 71; international relations, 65; social distance, 64; industrial relations, 63; communication, 54; social religion, 53; teaching sociology, 49; social control, 49; social change, 42; rural-urban changes, 35; war problems, 35; and other topics, 48. A small number of the articles were so evenly divided between two different topics that they have been included in both groups, and hence the total number of classified articles is somewhat larger than the actual number.

When the tabulation is broken down into the four decades of the Journal's history, it is seen that nearly all the articles on "war problems" fall in the third decade, 1937-46. There is a large bulge of articles on social disorganization in the second decade, 1927-36, followed closely by the third or wartime decade. The number of articles on the family, for instance, has steadily mounted in the four decades, increasing from 7 in the first decade to 31 in the fourth. The articles on industrial relations were 7 in the first period but 20 in the fourth. There were 5 articles on social distance during the first period but 19 for each of the next three periods. Articles on international relations jumped from 7 during the first ten years to 19 for each of the following ten-year periods.

⁶ In the earlier years the Journal had a series of circulation assistants, namely, Margaret Burke Beggs, Catherine Noel, George Nickel, and Weldon T. Spears.

Throughout the entire forty years an extensive book review section has been published in each issue. About 40 signed reviews and 10 unsigned shorter notes have appeared in each bimonthly issue. The signed reviews totaled about 250 a year, which add up to the grand total of reviews of 10,000 books. The main reviewers have been the associate editors and the editor of the Journal, the Ph.D.'s of the Department, and other sociologists. The reviews have appeared under a rough classification, such as social theory and research, peoples and culture, social problems and welfare, and unclassified books.

The subscription price of *Sociology and Social Research* has been increased 133 per cent since it was founded, but the costs of publication have during the same time been advanced approximately 300 per cent, and would have been greater if the editor, managing editor, and the associate editors had not served throughout the four decades without compensation. During the entire period the Journal has had the friendly support of the three administrations of the University of Southern California, headed in turn by Dr. George Finley Bovard, Dr. Rufus B. von KleinSmid, and Dr. Fred D. Fagg, Jr. The University of Southern California Press, except for a few years, has had charge of printing the Journal and has done splendid work in a cooperative manner. For two decades now the University Publications Office has given the accepted manuscripts a final editing and read galley and page proofs regularly in a thoroughly professional manner. Members of the Business Office of the University have taken charge of the finances of the Journal. The University's Mailing Department has attended to the distribution of each issue as it has appeared from the University Press. Young men and women on a part-time basis have provided splendid secretarial and office services.

Sociology and Social Research will enter on its fifth decade with a wealth of loyal friends and also of experience. It welcomes suggestions for the improvement of its publishing program insofar as they are in keeping with its resources. Its greatest practical problem is the fact that the costs of publication have been increasing faster than the increase in income. This problem is being offset to the extent that the permanent Endowment Fund of the Journal is slowly being augmented and is giving *Sociology and Social Research* a sense of stability, as well as being an encouragement to make the publishing program more stimulating to its readers.

PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL NEWS

Pacific Sociological Meeting. The annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society was held in Stockton on April 20 and 21. The College of the Pacific served as host for the arrangements at the Stockton Hotel. Papers read were for the most part comparable to those delivered at the national meeting. Joel V. Berreman's Presidential Address was particularly well received. The 1957 meeting of the Society is to be held on the campus of the University of Oregon, Eugene.

College of the Pacific. Harold Jacoby will spend the coming academic year in Japan on a special educational and research program.

Pomona College. Ray E. Baber, who has been chairman of the Pomona sociology department, will retire in June this year after having served on the Pomona faculty since 1939. Alvin H. Scaff, associate professor of sociology, will become the new chairman of the department. Charles M. Leslie, now at the University of Minnesota, and Harry V. Ball, now at Washington University in St. Louis, have been appointed to the Pomona sociology department.

University of California at Los Angeles. Ralph H. Turner, associate professor of sociology, has received a Guggenheim award and a Fulbright grant to study collective behavior in England for the coming academic year. Dr. Turner is the current President of the Pacific Sociological Society.

University of Southern California. Two members of the department were advanced in academic rank: Edward C. McDonagh to professor of sociology and Georges Sabagh to associate professor of sociology. Robert Ellis has been asked to serve on the Editorial Committee for the 1957 *Proceedings* of the Pacific Sociological Society. Three graduate students received their Ph.D. degrees this year: Dr. Alfonse Said of Cairo, Egypt, Dr. Thomas C. Keedy, Jr., who becomes chairman and associate professor at High Point College, and Dr. Lan Donia Dright, who continues in private practice as a human relations specialist. Dr. Benjamin Tregoe of Harvard University and Rand Corporation will teach one of the late afternoon classes of Professor Edward C. McDonagh, who has accepted a Smith-Mundt Visiting Professorship to the universities of Gothenburg and Lund, Sweden.

University of Washington. Professor Elio D. Monachesi of the University of Minnesota has been visiting professor for the first term of the summer quarter, giving courses in delinquency research and methods of research. Norman Hayner and Clarence Schrag will return to duty

in September, after leaves of absence to serve in positions with the state government. Dr. Hayner was chairman of the State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, and Dr. Schrag was Director of Correctional Institutions. Charles E. Bowerman and S. Frank Miyamoto have been promoted to the rank of associate professor.

PEOPLES AND CULTURE

CULTURAL VALUES OF AMERICAN ETHNIC GROUPS. By Sister Frances Jerome Woods. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1956, pp. 402.

An interesting book on the group habits, social expectations, and cultural values of ethnic groups in this country has been made available to members in the service professions of social work and teaching. The author has read very widely, and with considerable discrimination, before attempting this work. Each of the principal ethnic groups is examined as a subculture in the totality of the American culture. Significant contrasts between the dominant patterns and the particular patterns of selected ethnic groups are made with mature insight. The major areas of analysis of these ethnic groups include religion, economics, authority and government, recreation, and education. Especially strong chapters point up the several parental roles of the American, Oriental, Mexican, European, and Negro. No doubt empirical sociologists may find fault with some of the inclusive generalizations of the author concerning human behavior; however, this book will serve as a major conceptual tool for teachers, counselors, and social workers in the understanding of cultural conflicts.

E.C.M.

GERMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DIGEST. Hamburg: Claasen Verlag, 1955, pp. 167.

This booklet is published by a group of private citizens in Hamburg who wish "to further better understanding between the United States and Germany." This is a worthy object, and a real contribution of a scholarly nature is made to this end by this document. It contains a number of interesting reports, such as the one on "The Development of the West German Economy since 1945" by Egon Tuchtfeeldt, and especially the study of the "Elements of Social Stability" by Helmut Schelsky. The German economic study is supplemented by an excellent annotated bibliography. Nels Anderson reports on three important studies of German life.

ONE MAN'S AFRICA. By John Seymour. New York: The John Day Company, 1956, pp. 255.

The author reports on his experiences over a dozen years in southern Africa, southwest Africa, and eastern Africa as a farmer and miner, and his reactions on a later visit to many of the scenes of his earlier days in Africa. He is an English journalist who writes with a friendly yet vigorous criticism of the economic and social conditions as he originally found them and as he later observed them, particularly in terms of changes that have occurred over the years.

With reference to the Cape Coloured he asserts that Dr. Malan's Government "has caused the various groups of non-Europeans to sink their differences and come together politically," and that "the Nationalists must get ready to reap the whirlwind."

He finds that "Africa is changing with shattering rapidity" and that it is "not only hopeless but terribly dangerous to try to arrest this changing by repressive legislation." The natives have been deprived of their most valued freedom, that of going from one place to another except by "passes"; and they have lost most of their worth-while lands. They are being "dragged headlong into the industrial revolution" and "Mr. Strijdom cannot stop them. No politician ever stopped history."

The situation in South West Africa is described at length, and the tale is a sorry one. The Cape Coloured are being alienated from the white man when they might have become his allies and friends. The Bantu is on the march and will not always remain suppressed and relatively helpless. There is no venom in this book, but plenty of friendly warning.

E.S.B.

HAWAII AND ITS PEOPLE. By A. Grove Day. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1955, pp. 338.

The author gives an interesting account of the early inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands, their history during the pre-American years, the coming of American missionaries, the developments industrially during the current century, the loyal role of the Hawaiians in World War II, and the struggle, unsuccessful so far, to obtain a well-earned recognition as a state. The loyal and outstanding record of the Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II is cited, and the realization of the people of Hawaii that they are "the hub of American expansion in the world's largest ocean" is emphasized. The book is full of interesting details about the life of a people whose home is described as "the laboratory of democracy," where Americanism is being demonstrated in unique ways.

A.R.R.

BEHIND THE BAMBOO CURTAIN. By A. M. Dunlap, M.D. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956, pp. viii+208.

Dr. Dunlap, who has spent forty years in China as a physician, has written a perceptive eye-witness account of the effects of Communist domination upon Chinese life. The account of the Communist take-over is based mainly upon letters from Shanghai. The reader will find much information of genuine value pertaining to attitudes, values, and beliefs held by the Chinese people. The letters indicate that the Communist attempts to gain popular support for their practices and principles have been blocked by strong Chinese traditions dating back for a hundred generations. American attempts to influence public opinion in China, if they are to be genuinely successful, must take into account the Chinese culture to a greater extent.

The author points out: "A culture such as the Chinese have had, which stretches back more than four thousand years, and has withstood many pressures through the ages, some as great in magnitude as the present one, will again emerge and China will take her place beside the free nations of the world."

T. C. KEEDY, JR.

KOREA TOMORROW. By Kyung Cho Chung. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956, pp. xxv+384.

The author—a Korean educated in Korea, Japan, and the United States—gives a digest of the natural, historical, economic, political, cultural, and social history of Korea. Then he describes "a divided Korea," the Korean War, and in the final chapter discusses the prospect "for Korea tomorrow."

Professor Chung states that "the Korean Problem was created by the major powers" and suggests a number of Korean needs today: (1) reunification, (2) the right to self-government, (3) world-wide assistance in the rehabilitation of the country, (4) applying the principles of peace, unification, and rehabilitation as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, and (5) a settlement of the Korean problem by basing it on "the legitimate interests of the Korean people and incorporating the elements of justice and of mutual accommodation between nations."

A Prefatory Note is written by General Mark W. Clark, in which he states that he gained "the unenviable distinction of being the first United States Army Commander in history to sign an armistice without victory." The book is informative and gives bases for a sociological analysis of a national group caught between two world-wide ideologies.

E.S.B.

POPULATION. By Dennis H. Wrong. New York: Random House, 1956, pp. 128.

This little book contains seven chapters dealing with the following subjects: the field of demography, world population growth and distribution, mortality, fertility, differential fertility, migration, and the Malthusian problem. In a book of this size it is not possible to cover all important topics in demography. Such matters as the statistics of marriage and divorce, population forecasts, government population policies, and the relation between population and national power are omitted.

The author points out that in the field of demography, where there are vast mines of data to be analyzed, there is danger of subordinating general conclusions to detailed enumeration of evidence which makes it impossible to see the forest for the trees. This book is valuable as a brief introduction to demography, which explains important concepts and which has a good discussion of the Malthusian problem in the light of present economic and demographic developments.

ROBERT H. JORDAN

INTERNATIONAL PEOPLE'S COLLEGE. Elsinore, Denmark: Annual, 1955, pp. 55.

Contains the principal's report and brief articles on Danish social legislation and folk high schools in India.

JOBS AND WORKERS IN INDIA. By Oscar a Ornati. Ithaca, New York: Institute of International Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1955, pp. xix+215.

Prepared as a handbook on labor and labor problems in India for students, businessmen, trade union leaders, and government officials who might wish to study, invest, or work in India, this report on India's present industrial situation may be significantly important. It is a revealing one, presenting a panorama of labor problems and discussing the major events which have affected India's industrial workers. Sociologically interesting is the analysis of "the degree to which the mores and work-habits of one-time agricultural workers need to change to satisfy the demands of industry and of the manner in which the change takes place." Indian workers as a group have failed thus far to assimilate the habits of industrial workers, due largely to a lack of what Ornati calls urban amenities. Those factors which make for improvements in working conditions, such as cleanliness and sanitation and the

provision of better housing facilities, have been found to make for better labor-management relations. Organization among workers has increased in recent years, there being three new and independent trade union centers closely associated with the major political parties. Strangely enough, with the increase in organization, real wages have decreased and a large amount of unemployment has occurred due to the end of the war industrial machine and the re-entry of Japan's industrial products into commerce. Better industrial relations are needed, but there is an apparent apathy in obtaining them.

M.J.V.

ISRAEL THE ETERNAL IDEAL. By Irving Miller. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1955, pp. viii+148.

In this well-written treatise Rabbi Miller describes the age-old origins and the new developments of the republic Israel in a way to make "the historical motivation and religious impulse" of the Republic of Israel stand forth as a highly significant force. The present republic began two thousand years or more ago in the aspirations of a handful of people migrating westward out of the Euphrates Valley. Currently, the Republic began with the beginning of Jewish migration about 1882 to Palestine, a migration which has assumed large proportions during the past few decades and which received a powerful stimulus from the Zionist movement under Herzl and Weizmann.

The continued, persistent, and adverse reactions of the Arabs to the influx of Jews into Palestine, which the Arabs still view as their own territory, are described in some detail. The rise of a democratic state within gunshot of Arab guns is discussed, and Israel's economic and assimilation problems are made plain. The refugee problem as a continuing source of fermenting ill will is discussed. The Arab nations are described as being limited in one respect in that "they all recognize in Israel a threat to the political and social feudalism on which the power of their leaders is based."

However, to suggest that the solution of the Arab-Israel conflict is "to prevail upon the Arabs to make peace with Israel" is easier said than done, especially when the Arabs are emotionally and indubitably constrained to believe that Israel is being built on, as they say, stolen property. In view of the very feudalism which functions so largely in many of the Arab countries, it is almost impossible to persuade them to receive with friendly gestures a democratic state, no matter how worthy it may be, if it is viewed as an interloper. Hate that feeds on a sense of gross injustice is the giant that needs to be tackled and overcome.

E.S.B.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND WELFARE

EDUCATION FOR MARRIAGE. By James A. Peterson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956, pp. xxiii+429.

This textbook is divided into four parts which cover the usual content of college courses in marriage: preparing for marriage, making a wise choice, preparation for marital "togetherness," and the achievement of togetherness.

The content of this outline has, however, several distinctive features: (1) More than usual attention is given to specific experiences of growing up which are relevant to subsequent marital behavior. When books on marriage do not ignore socialization altogether, they often discuss it so generally that all aspects are made to appear equally important in mate choice and marriage adjustment. (2) A judicious selection of research findings and case materials is used to illustrate the points developed in each chapter. The author thus avoids the common fault of presenting scattered results of available research on marriage either as scientifically conclusive or as materials offered for their own intrinsic value. The works of Burgess and his collaborators and of Locke are especially drawn on. (3) A chapter based largely on original research considers the religious factor in marital adjustment. (4) A separate chapter on military service as a factor in making a wise marriage choice is included. (5) Fairly detailed guides are provided for "self-analysis" by students so they may apply the discussion of appropriate chapters to their own experiences and situations.

These special features are additional to competent presentations of such standard subjects as dating and engagement, sexual aspects of the marriage process, research findings of factors predictive of marital success, and specific aspects of married life affecting family unity. It is typical of the viewpoint of the book that the last chapter is entitled "Contributions of Conflict to Family Cohesion."

This book achieves unusual unity and coherence from the author's recognition that education for marriage requires primary emphasis on growth in maturity and insight of the individual and that this involves both knowledge and the modification of attitudes. The book therefore frankly supports a point of view. It seeks to heighten the student's self-awareness with respect to personal, interpersonal, and cultural factors so that he may go through the processes leading to marriage and to marital success more deliberately. The author is not dogmatic in his interpretation of ways to achieve growth and maturity with respect to

marriage, but neither is the student left with the sense of inconclusiveness and contradiction which can come from the presentation of materials without a set of values within which they may be applied.

This book is not intended to be a scholarly or scientific contribution to knowledge. It is addressed to the student and his teacher who are concerned with the use of research and experience for educational purposes. As a balanced, thoughtful, and sensitive work, the book is successful in achieving this purpose.

HENRY J. MEYER

New York University

ECONOMIC NEEDS OF OLDER PEOPLE. By John J. Corson and John W. McConnell. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1956, pp. xvii + 533.

This is a thoroughgoing study of the problems and needs of older people. Not only is their proportion increasing but the reasons for this increase are clearly presented. Unfortunately, nearly three fourths of all persons over sixty-five years of age either are without income or obtain less than \$1,000 a year. The majority of men between sixty-five and seventy are still at work, but only a minority thereafter.

In some occupations age is of greater moment than in others, but, once unemployed, the older person faces serious hiring restrictions. Many companies will not hire a person over forty-five, even though he is competent and able. The study does not emphasize the age restrictions frequently imposed by various governmental agencies. Increased use of machinery and the relocation of industrial plants are cited as causes of loss of employment in private industry.

One third of the persons over sixty-five are receiving social security benefits or annuities from some retirement program. The majority of the low income group, however, have not found the benefits adequate for normal living. Needs are not met, because many are ill and suffer from lasting sickness. Among the charges against older workers are the claims that they lack vigor, alertness, and full-scale productivity.

Housing problems, living conditions, savings, and employability are ably discussed. The major portion of the book concerns itself with methods of care. Among the suggestions analyzed are the Townsend Plan, universal pension systems, the Meriam Proposal, the pay-as-you-go method, and present systems of aid and security.

In 1944 the U.S. Chamber of Commerce took a brave stand in favor of benefits for totally and permanently disabled persons fifty-five years of age and older, only to rescind this action in 1948; yet this is a group that the Committee of the Twentieth Century Fund insisted must be

given security. Both capital and labor are called upon to become instrumental in lengthening the trade life of the workers, but no practical methods of bringing about results are proposed. The present contributory social insurance should be extended and government required to assume a basic role in providing for the well-being of older people.

G.B.M.

CRIME AND SOCIETY. By Gresham M. Sykes. New York: Random House, 1956, pp. 125.

The major theme of this book is that the study of crime gives more than the solution of the immediate demands of current social problems, namely, the causes and consequences of social action. The titles of the chapters are Social Norms and Criminal Law, The State versus the Accused, Society and Its Crimes, Society and Its Criminals, Crime and Punishment, Men in Prison. The basic reason for criminology, according to the final statement of the text, is to increase an understanding of man's relationship to man in society and in this way control and prevent crime. The book makes good supplemental reading for elementary courses in criminology.

WOODROW W. SCOTT

George Pepperdine College

CRIMINOLOGY. By Robert G. Caldwell. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1956, pp. xxi+749.

This introduction to criminology is designed as a textbook for college students, but it is also a useful book for law enforcement officers and correctional administrators. It deals with the problem of crime, causation, crime and justice, and correction. Over half of the book is devoted to correction, the work of the police, and the juvenile court, with special chapters on criminal investigation and military justice. One of the salient features of the book is the description and evaluation of the various types of approaches to the analysis of the causes of crime and delinquency and to the different methods of treatment. The individual as well as the group approaches are stressed. A wide range of literature is surveyed to provide a broad background for the understanding of the problem. Short excerpts of cases are included, which make the discussions more interesting and helpful. The detailed stress on the legal and social-problems aspects and on the historical development and current practice in law enforcement is helpful but in some instances a little monotonous. On the whole, the book is one of better types of textbooks that have been published during recent years.

M.H.N.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK. By Arthur Hillman. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956, pp. 72.

Dean Hillman covers a large territory in a well-balanced way in this booklet. The subjects discussed include the role of social work in contemporary society, the social services operated by government agencies, voluntary welfare agencies, the various methods and types of social work, the place of social work as a profession, and the possibility of a social philosophy of social work. The need for sociological research in the social work field is indicated. The document will help to further collaboration between sociologists and social workers.

PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS. By F. Emerson Andrews. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956, pp. 459.

This book is another in the series on philanthropy which Russell Sage Foundation has issued in the past ten years. It might be called a handbook for the intelligent and wise use of funds entrusted to foundations. The study describes such areas of operation as selection of form of organization, boards of trustees, finances, professional staff, fields of activity to be supported, and legal problems. The present position of foundations, following two Congressional inquiries within four years, is discussed. Specific and helpful information about making application is given.

The Foundation is defined as "an instrument for contributing private wealth to public purpose," which is nongovernmental, nonprofit, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare. It is estimated that there are about 5,000 foundations in the United States with assets of around \$5 billion and yearly expenditures of \$400 million. They are concentrated on the eastern seaboard with New York alone having 1,238 or over one third. The Pacific Coast region has 235 foundations with 195 of them in California.

Contrary to a current impression that large foundations will not be created in the future, Mr. Andrews reports that foundations with assets of over \$50 million numbered 14 in 1953 compared with 4 in 1930. Heavy taxation on income, with deduction for gifts permitted, has caused many families to set up small foundations. Some of these represent a pooling of gifts for philanthropic purposes; others are established primarily to lessen the burden of taxation through contributions from income annually. Abuses were largely corrected by the Revenue Act of 1950, which makes reporting mandatory, outlines certain "prohibited

transactions" which can lead to loss of tax exemption, and forbids "unreasonable" accumulation of funds. A better system of administration is needed; at present the information is in 64 regional offices rather than in a central registry. Very few states require registration and systematic reporting.

Education, health, and welfare are the fields of activity most favored. When funds are spent as "venture capital," they bring rich returns in exploring new frontiers of knowledge. The record of the older foundations in this respect is a very creditable one. ARLIEN JOHNSON

LAWLESS YOUTH. A Psychiatric Study of the Causes and Prevention of Adolescent Crime. By E. A. Stephens. New York: Pageant Press, 1955, pp. ix+315.

According to the author, his body of information contained in this book "was accumulated during the clinical examination of 1,000 anti-social youths ranging in age from fifteen to twenty-one, observed in institutional and private practice." Of these, the author selected 600 for statistical study on the basis of developmental and behavior data. The examinations consist of personal and direct interviews, biographical data furnished by the individual, parents, schools, and sociologists, a complete physical examination, and ancillary aids, such as psychometric tests, projective techniques, electroencephalograms. Among the conclusions the author arrived at are the following: poverty and crime are not related, as not 1 out of 600 committed a crime because of need for himself or for his family; slum clearance will not reduce crime materially; crime disappears "as love enters the home"; and juvenile delinquency "shows no upswing during periods of depression."

HANS A. ILLING

SOCIOLOGY OF URBANIZATION: A STUDY IN URBAN SOCIETY. By T. Earl Sullenger. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Braun-Brumfield, Inc., 1956.

This book attempts to give a survey of urbanization, beginning with the early developments of the city and its fringe area and then describing the centers of population concentration, urban mobility and migration, and the physical aspects of city living. These aspects include housing; the urban family, church, recreation, and educational activities; city government and control, planning and zoning; urban personalities and the maladjustments of urbanization. Considerable attention is given to urbanization. The fringe or suburban area is where two culture groups—rural and urban—meet on a physical and functional basis.

As the author puts it, "this little book has grown out of thirty-three years of teaching urban sociology." One can find in it old and new material, with a selected bibliography giving the main sources on urban life.

M.H.N.

ALCOHOLISM: ITS PSYCHOLOGY AND CURE. By Frederick B. Rea. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956, pp. 143.

There are today in the United States, according to recent estimates by the World Health Organization, more than three and one-half million alcoholics, constituting a social problem of significant dimensions.

The author treats his material in two major divisions, which he terms "Addiction" and "Cure." In Part One there is interesting information about the metabolism of alcohol and the types of persons who tend to become alcoholic (unfortunately lumping religious, cultural, and national groups together under the term *race*). Part Two describes a number of the major treatment clinics in Western society, then moves on to a portrayal of the work of Alcoholics Anonymous, particularly in Great Britain, which seems to be better known to the author. A brief concluding section outlines the "Spiritual Causes of Addiction."

There is a lack of a clear-cut frame of reference, for the author moves from religious orthodoxy to scientific behaviorism almost at random; he prods psychiatry for "losing sight of the need for personal responsibility" (a misinterpretation of much modern psychiatric theory, which stresses, rather than ignores, personal responsibility). There is this concluding plea: "Alcoholism is not simply a medical problem, nor simply a problem of psychology; it is not solely a question of moral, or of spiritual imperfection. In the recovery of the alcoholic all these healing agencies must unite to play a part."

CARROLL H. RICHARDSON

SWEDEN, THE WELFARE STATE. By Wilfrid Fleisher. New York: The John Day Company, 1956, pp. 255.

The author is a journalist of considerable experience and is currently a resident correspondent in Stockholm for *Newsweek*. He has canvassed welfare activities in Sweden—such as the cooperatives, housing, compulsory health insurance, child welfare, care of the aged, prison reform—and concludes the survey by asking who pays and by giving an appraisal.

He has interviewed leaders of the welfare movement and the opponents and presents both viewpoints. He introduces a unique feature in interviews with persons and families who benefit in varying degrees

from one welfare program or another. He fails to recognize that the cooperatives are a form of free enterprise—"the freest form of free enterprise," as they are sometimes called; that they are privately owned and operated, as are other forms of free enterprise; that they are forms of private business in a real sense of that term. They do not suppress personal initiative, perhaps not as much as other forms of private business. They are a basic form of private ownership, with a wide distribution of the surpluses.

The author poses the problem of security versus freedom. Some Swedes believe that their welfare program gives a greatly needed measure of security from the beginning to the end of life without hampering the freedom of the individual. Others disagree, and add that the cost is great. It is an anomaly that "about half the Government's expenditure in social welfare" comes from the sale of tobacco and liquor and that part of the income from the government sales of liquor goes for "new homes for alcoholics."

E.S.B.

EMPIRE IN WOOD. By Robert A. Christie. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1956, pp. xvii+356.

The subtitle of this excellent book is "A History of the Carpenters' Union," meaning of course the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. The story of the development of this union is correlated with the growth and changes in the basic organization of the industry, with the widening of the labor market and advancement in technology, the latter being directly associated with the creation of the present-day national union of carpenters. A functional purpose of this account has been to shed some light upon the hitherto almost neglected study of the role of the workers as a class in the history of the United States. Christie points out that the field of labor relations has "risen and thrived in what, but for the work of the Commons group, would be a historical vacuum," since union archives have not always been available for academic research and union leaders have been wary of research men. Most interesting in this report is the dramatic presentation of union leader Big Bill Hutcherson, president emeritus of the Carpenters' Union. This phase of the story might well have been entitled "How to Run and Maintain and Dominate a Union Empire." The first task of the union "has been to retain for the carpenter the work done by him in 1881," states the author, and the degree of success with which this has been done is exceedingly well related in the final chapter. This book, then, represents a good case study of a power group and a power leader.

M.J.V.

SOCIAL THEORY AND RESEARCH

WHAT IS COMMUNISM? Edited by Richard M. Ketchum. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1955, pp. 191.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY? Edited by Richard M. Ketchum. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1955, pp. 191.

These two books may be considered separately or as complementary to each other, in the sense that communism and democracy are incompatible ideologies and ways of life. The survey of communism, in broad outline and with exceptionally vivid illustrations, shows how communism manifests itself in various parts of the world, the principles and practices of communism representative of the U.S.S.R., the Soviet satellites and China, the failures of communism, the suffering of its victims. It is also shown who oppose communism and why they are opposed to the communist system.

The exposition of democracy, on the other hand, presents a well-integrated outline of the roots of democracy, its development to fit the will and needs of various peoples, its economic aspects, contemporary problems of democracy, the nature of internal and external threats to democracy, ways to preserve and expand democracy, and what democracy offers the individual as the true test of its worth. This volume also is profusely illustrated. Both volumes include questions and answers about the ideology stressed and useful bibliographies. Both books deserve wide reading to clarify the issues in communist aggression and to warn democracies against apathy.

J.E.N.

THE SANE SOCIETY. By Erich Fromm. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1955, pp. xiii+370.

The author develops the thought that "the basic passions of man are not rooted in his instinctive needs, but in the specific conditions of human existence." The author asserts that both capitalism and communism are based on industrialization, that both are run by "a managerial class and by professional politicians," that both tend to make individuals into cogs of a machine, and that both use "psychological conditioning, mass suggestion, monetary rewards," and that in addition communism uses violence and terror, with no chance for the individual to criticize the system. In both the result is robotism, states the author, and a sane society is one in which the member is freed from this robotism by being enabled to become "a mentally healthy person," who "feels one with his fellow man," who is in "the process of being born as long as he is alive."

E.S.B.

URBAN SOCIOLOGY. By Egon Ernest Bergel. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955, pp. 558.

In many ways this text is more interesting to read than the typical work available for students in urban sociology. There is a good blending of historical and descriptive materials on the nature of urban life. Readers will not be bored by the endless repetition of examples from the author's community of residence and research. In fact, in several particulars this text seems to present a cosmopolitan overview of urban processes and characteristics. Splendid discussions are presented on urban class, ecology, and ethnic relations. For the most part, the author has attempted to follow the thinking of the 1950 Census on the matter of urban areas. Cities are something more significant than political units; they represent a way of living common to a great many people in proximity to the city. Another good feature in this text is the cautious use of statistics and tables; hence, the book seems to have an organic unity sometimes difficult to sense in competing texts.

E.C.M.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH. Revised Edition. By F. Stuart Chapin. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955, pp. xii+297.

This well-known and oft-quoted book has been revised and augmented with four new chapters bearing the titles Analysis of Variance and the t-Statistic: Underlying Assumptions, Nonparametric or Distribution-Free Statistical Methods, The Ex Post Facto Design: Replications and Extension, and Some Problems in Psycho-Social Measurement. The new materials are presented in Chapin's usual lucid style and should be welcomed by students who may wish to further their own experimentations with the methods described. Chapin has sketched in detail the analysis of variance and the difficulties in applying its mathematical statistical assumptions in designs for research on human subjects in the free community situation. Described also is a new nonparametric method devised by Sol Haberman, which may be considered a method of partially ordered systems of expectations, supposed to demonstrate the application of probability tests for the nonrandom as well as the random small samples. Ex post facto procedures are examined and treated with meticulous care by the presentation of new cases. Chapin announces that these designs might stand to gain materially from developments in the area of nonparametric statistical method. In Appendix C, replying to critics, he declares that his concept of an ex post facto experimental design "will have to rest on evidence yet to be gathered."

The book closes with several well-pointed remarks about the difficulties encountered by researchers in attempting various psychosocial measurements, complimenting Louis Guttman and Paul Lazarsfeld for the scalogram and mathematical models.

M.J.V.

A LARGER CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY. By Jefferson B. Fordham.
Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1956, pp. 117.

To the traditional types of levels of government, the author, who is dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, adds the super-local type or metropolitan, the transstate regional, and the international. These three today challenge demands upon "our vision, our courage, and our capacity for political organization and action which are of fateful importance."

Metropolitanism or "sprawling urbanism" urgently calls for "an enlarged concept of the local community." It bespeaks a widespread interest in "community problems viewed in metropolitan-wide terms," which many suburban members of a metropolitan community try to escape.

The author cites a number of transstate regional organizations now in operation and points out that "in terms of actual communities of interest in this country, the states are a very artificial configuration." He says that the term "states' rights" has "an emotive function but is not a good tool of communication." Through the years it has been "the plea of the most disparate economic and political groups, which have had in common only the belief that the federal government was doing something to which they were opposed." He thinks that to speak of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its work as "creeping socialism" is "worse than obfuscation; it is indiscriminate criticism by slogan." He speaks of the TVA as "magnificent in conception, efficient in administration, and remarkably salutary in result. I think of it as a great national achievement which does credit to us all."

Regarding the international community, Dean Fordham sees it in "as wide perspective as the need for effective cooperative action." He refers to the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act as "an unhappy example of exaggerated nationalism," and of the Bricker Resolution as a means that would "protect us against ourselves and the hazards of a troubled world by limiting our own national sovereignty." The only adequate base "to control armament and establish the condition of peace is the entire world." The Clark and Sohn plan is endorsed with qualifications for "a federation of the nations of the world in which

membership would be compulsory," and which would have an Executive Council of fifteen members of the General Assembly (with representatives voting as individuals and not as nations, and with each of the six largest nations guaranteed a member). Decisions of the Council would require an affirmative vote of eleven members. This book is small, but Dean Fordham is a legal authority who undoubtedly expresses the opinions of many progressive-minded persons in many countries.

E.S.B.

SOCIOLOGY. A BOOK OF READINGS. Edited by Samuel Koenig, Rex D. Hopper, and Feliks Gross. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953, pp. xvi+607.

This collection of readings (there are 111 of them) appears to be intended primarily for use as a source book or for collateral assignments in introductory sociology. The major divisions of the book are as follows: the physical and cultural bases of human society, the individual and society, societal institutions, the human community, collective behavior, and the dynamics of social life. The readings are so grouped that they touch upon most of the areas deemed essential in an introductory course, but the topical development is markedly uneven. In general, the selections are short, interesting, descriptive. They deal with certain aspects of subjects, all of them worth while, though the treatment is not thorough enough to fulfill the needs of a text.

J.E.N.

MAN IN RECIPROCITY: INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON CULTURE, SOCIETY, AND PERSONALITY. By Howard Becker. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956, pp. xx+459.

This book is a compilation of lectures given by Professor Becker in an introductory course in anthropology and sociology presented on the Wisconsin State radio station WHA Madison from the classrooms of the University of Wisconsin. A tabular key to supplementary readings is provided. The author sets as his goal the examination of the most fundamental kinds of human association and dissociation. As a basis for his lectures he points out the similarities and dissimilarities of man and other animals, giving particular emphasis to the biological factors that make man different. Culture, sacred and secular societies, social institutions, value systems and their interrelationships in society are examined, followed by a discussion of social contacts and the basic social processes of advance, adjustment, accordance, amalgamation, competition, conflict, and others. These processes are pointed up in societies of different character and circumstances.

Social standards, social control, and social change are discussed in their various relationships to man and his social conduct. Dr. Becker has given much effort to include many poems and quotations to make the text a rich source of illustrative material of a literary nature. The bibliography and the completeness of the table of contents should prove useful. Professor Becker has done a splendid job in presenting important sociological and anthropological materials.

WOODROW W. SCOTT

George Pepperdine College

AN OUTLINE OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. By Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956, pp. 792.

The second edition of this text on social psychology has been improved by careful editing and by bringing up to date the scientific literature from the fields of psychology, sociology, and anthropology. For the most part, it represents a synthesis of the empirical knowledge from three fields. Social psychology is conceived as "the scientific study of the experience and behavior of individuals in relation to social stimulus situations." These social stimulus situations are composed of people (individuals and groups) and items of the sociocultural setting.

Probably the most challenging topics analyzed in this work are the nature of groups, group norms, and the growth and significance of ego involvements. The Sherifs bring to the field of social psychology several original and experimental studies on group norms and interaction. College students who use this book cannot fail to be impressed with the mutual importance of group norms and ego involvements in their own lives. Sociologists may feel that not enough attention has been paid to the importance of social stratification in the development of differential norms and levels of aspiration. However, this possible weakness can easily be overcome by the instructor. In summary, the Sherifs have made a good book better and the field of social psychology more meaningful.

E.C.M.

AMERICA'S NEEDS AND RESOURCES: A NEW SURVEY. By J. Frederic Dewhurst and Associates. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1955, pp. xxvi+1148.

The original edition, published in 1947, rapidly became a standard reference source. The new edition, which is even more pretentious in scope of material covered, has the added advantage of containing comparative data. As stated in the Foreword, "the new volume accomplished two purposes. It gives the present position of American economic re-

sources, production and consumption. It establishes a basis of comparison with earlier figures and thus makes it possible to see with some clarity the extent of progress made." (vii) The investigators likewise make some predictions regarding future developments, but they are cautious in indicating possible future trends, for they recognize the difficulties that beset any attempt to project the past into the future. The main part of the book is devoted to the factual presentation of data gathered from a wide range of sources. Dr. Dewhurst was assisted by twenty-five specialists working five years to prepare the present report, with Thomas C. Fichandler as associate research director on the project. The twenty-six chapters are grouped into six parts: I. Basic Trends, II. Consumption Requirements, III. Capital Requirements, IV. Government and Foreign Transactions, V. Resources and Capacities, and VI. Summary. The chapters of special importance to sociologists are those dealing with the growth of the population, income and expenditures, housing, health and medical care, recreation, education, religion, welfare, urban redevelopment, the labor force, and the summary which emphasizes needs versus resources. The book contains 352 tables, 105 figures, and 171 pages of appendices.

America now has the most productive economic system in human history and in the entire world, "capable of attaining by 1960 a total national output of \$414 billion and making possible an average family income of more than \$6,000 per year, with prospects of still greater growth in the years ahead." This is regarded as one of the central conclusions of the study. It is estimated that at the present rate of growth, the population of the United States will be 177 million in 1960, of whom 69 million should be at work or in the armed forces. With only 6 per cent of the world's population and less than 7 per cent of its land area, the United States now produces and consumes well over one third of the world's goods and services. The aggregate real income is probably greater than the combined income of 600 million people living in Europe and Russia. The shorter working week (40-hour week as compared with a 70-hour week a century ago) has given people more leisure for recreation.

In spite of these and other gains, many Americans are still living in substandard houses and have inadequate clothing, insufficient food, schooling, medical care, and other basic requirements. These and other problems must be appraised in terms of the high productivity and standard of living, the fruits of a "high-energy civilization." The survey provides the facts and the background essential for appraising the present and planning intelligently for the future.

M.H.N.

SOCIAL FICTION

THE LAST HURRAH. A Novel by Edwin O'Connor. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1956, pp. 427.

Frank Skeffington—city boss, tribal chieftain, and politician de luxe in the arena of his own unnamed Eastern city, and its four-time elected mayor—has through the skilled artistry of novelist O'Connor been brought to an almost living reality in this notable sociopolitical novel. Shrewd, witty, knavish, and yet warmhearted, the mayor romps through his last campaign with all the gusto that his Irish heart can master at the age of 72. Hated by the upper class of his city for having led a kind of torrential political war against them, he has determined to symbolize for them what a last hurrah for him will mean for them. When first he entered politics, his Irish people were but a minority, and the city Brahmins had determined to keep them a subdued minority at that. It was for these lowly Irish tribes that he had fought, clinched and slugged his way through one political fight after another, until even the most respectable Brahmins had to respect him for his political know-how.

Opposing him in the final battle of his career is Kevin McCluskey, hand-picked for his callowness, adaptability, and easy manipulateness. Skeffington's campaign is adroitly handled by himself with the aid of the old ward bosses and their henchmen, including John Gorman, of the city's oldest ward, and Fotsie McEntee, who could get from one polling place to another in jet-plane fashion. Portrayed in an unforgettable manner are the methods and tactics of the now fast-disappearing old-time campaign, the down-to-earth personal visits, including an Irish wake held for Knocko Minihan, handshaking with the Italians, contenders for the old Irish supremacy, luncheon with the Audubon Society, and a conference with the local council of the Knights of Columbus. No stone is left unturned as Skeffington brings into play all his native Irish charm, eloquence, wit, and sharp storytelling. "Everytime I blow my nose, it's political," he tells his nephew as they travel from meeting to meeting during the campaign.

This last feverish battle is his swan song. When he returns from the various wards come in, it is all too apparent that Skeffington will not celebrate a victory. His henchmen have not been successful, and the great political career is at an end. Not long after, his funeral turned out to be the largest ever held in the city. Even his avowed enemies were in the Cathedral for the final rites, and one of them whispered to himself—as he remembered "the courage, generosity, the charm, the sheer ability of the man"—"If only he had not been such a rogue."

M.J.V.

CASH McCALL. A Novel by Cameron Hawley. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1955, pp. 444.

Cameron Hawley (*Executive Suite*) turns out a neatly constructed novel on the art of making money, an art practiced at its highest level by his hero, Cash McCall. Cash can say of himself: "I'm a thoroughly vulgar character—I enjoy making money." But the reader will find that despite Cash's accusing finger thus pointed at himself, he has a sympathetic heart of gold. He can also declare that the way to get the most fun out of a deal is "to work it so that everybody comes out a winner."

Dramatically narrated, the story is filled with a nice tide of suspense. Novelist Hawley times the appearance of his protagonist, not allowing him to appear on the scene until page 149—or, as one might say in the theater, not until the second act does the star appear. Through this device, the social mirrors of several of the leading characters have had a chance to reflect something of their portraits of Cash. When he does finally appear, the man is not the satyr of the moneybags but a kind of admirable Prince Chap who possesses what might be called a socialized acquisitive impulse for gathering in golden sheaves. Author Cameron admires his creation and gives him a good passing grade for taking advantage of the know-how to make money in a system devoted to freedom of enterprise, while at the same time spanking those who would call money-making a sordid affair. Says Cash, "We have a peculiar national attitude toward money-making. We maintain that the very foundation of our way of life is what we call free enterprise—the profit system. We're so serious about it that we will fight to preserve it—literally go to war—but when one of our citizens shows enough free enterprise to pile up a little of that profit, we do our best to make him feel that he ought to be ashamed of himself."

The novel is enriched with some good materials for sociological purposes. Data for use in discussing social stratification are especially abundant as are those which may be utilized in presenting role playing and role behavior. The characters, all well drawn, are nicely analyzed from the motivational point of view, while the social situations depicted in the business offices are clearly and sharply analyzed. The author, one-time corporation executive, bringing his knowledge of the world of business into his story and adding a romantic interest to it, has succeeded in writing a novel that is distinctly a contribution.

M.J.V.

SOCIAL PHOTOPLAY

Day of Triumph will be reviewed here as a study in role playing, although most reviews will consider it in its religious aspects, for it presents the adult life of Christ. The acting in the main is good, and the color photography of this full-length religious film is excellent.

For a modern actor to play the role of the Christ before motion picture cameras is a most difficult undertaking. Accepting the performance as a proper undertaking, one must temper his criticism of it as a study in role playing. If done two-thirds well it deserves favorable comment.

It is a kindly, poised, human-hearted Christ that is enacted, except for the brief, justifiable show of indignation on finding the money changers in control of the temple. The opening scene could have been handled better if more indirection had been used, with only the voice of the Christ being heard at first and then followed by a white-robed appearance in the distance, before the close-up views are given. The role of performing miracles is performed well and might have been developed further. The temptation role is underplayed, while the crucifixion scenes are greatly overplayed. Here is where a fine opportunity for the art of indirection was lost. The resurrection and day-of-triumph role which might have been made a fitting and powerful climax to this life-drama takes second place to the crucifixion.

The playing of Pilate's role merits high commendation. It shows well the struggle of a man with his conscience and his inglorious capitulation to crowd psychology. The Lord's Supper does not come up to expectations and the choosing of the disciples seems almost casual. The roles of Peter and John are greatly underplayed, while the roles of the Zealots as conspirators are well played but could have been abbreviated to advantage. The Judas Iscariot role receives extended and repeated prominence. It would have been presented more satisfactorily if not played to such length. The Mary Magdalene seems out of character and quite inadequate for the theme represented.

The New Testament records are followed rather closely, although the film suffers from omissions of important events and too lengthy presentations of other aspects, such as the crucifixion and the Judas role. The producer, who is well experienced in the field of religious plays, is to be complimented on keeping grand "spectacles" out of the picture and on presenting a film that creates a restrained and dignified picture—one that ranks near the top of high-ranking motion pictures.

E.S.B.

Sociology and Social Research

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



Articles in Forthcoming Issues . . .

September-October 1956 and later

Evaluations of Marriage and Adjustment	CHARLES BOWERMAN
Jewish Casts in Cochin, India	H. H. SMYTHE AND T. GERSHUNY
Disaster-displaced Families	H. E. MOORE AND F. R. CRAWFORD
Research for Sociology Undergraduates	ROLAND L. WARREN
A Functional Theory of Religion	THOMAS F. HOULT
Social Distance among Foreign Students	PANOS D. BARDIS
International Trends in Juvenile Delinquency ..	MARTIN H. NEUMEYER
Social Class and Social Perception	CHARLES B. SPAULDING
Technology as Environment	WILLIAM F. OGBURN
Labor in Review: 1955	MELVIN J. VINCENT
Public Ignorance about Correctional Work	J. ROY LEEVY
Older Person Adjustments in Church	ROBERT M. GRAY
Behavior of Panic Participants	E. L. QUARANTELLI
Chinese Immigration Changes	ROSE HUM LEE
Redirecting Human Forces	FRANK T. CARLTON
Ideal-Community Theory	HENRY ZENTNER
Outsider's Role in Field Study	H. M. TRICE
Special Problems in Sociological Research	DONALD S. DUSHKIND
Attitudes of Negro Newspapers	MAXWELL R. BROOKS
Interviewing in Values Research	LAWRENCE PODELL
Racial Differences in Intellectual Roles	WILSON RECORD

Articles in Preceding Issue . . .

May-June 1956

Language Usage as a Possible Index of Acculturation	JULIAN SAMORA AND WILLIAM N. DEANE
Attitudes of Whites and Nonwhites toward Each Other	WARREN BROWN AND J. OSCA ALERS
Is the Culture-Personality Approach at All Possible?	SVEND RIEMER
Socioeconomic Background and Theatrical Preference	RAYMOND A. MULLIGAN AND JANE C. DINKINS
Factors in the Cohesiveness of Small Groups	T. C. KEEDY, JR.
Class or Status Society	JOEL B. MONTAGUE, JR.
Social Distance and Politics: Some Selected Relationships	WALLACE H. BEST AND CHARLES P. SOHNER
Constructive Social Aspects of Atomic Energy	EMORY S. BOGARDUS

